THEOLOGY Digest

Progress in the Interpretation of Sacred Scripture 67
A. Bea, S.J.

The Biblical Question 72
Severiano del Paramo, S.J.

The Catholic Concept of Tradition 81
Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.

Tradition and Apostolic Preaching 88
Gottlieb Söhngen

Why Not Keep Our Latin Liturgy? 92
John J. Coyne

Retribution or Rehabilitation 98
M. Thiéfry, S.J.

Missiology and the Catholicity of the Church 104
Jean Bruls, S.A.M.

Obedience and Liberty 110
Th. Camelot, O.P.

Liturgical Conferences: A Report 114

The Act of Faith 119
Msgr. H. Francis Davis

Teleogenesis 123
Bermudo Meléndez

Brief and ACCURATE

CONDENSATIONS OF CAREFULLY SELECTED ARTICLES

Vol. 1, No. 2, Spring 1953

THEOLOGY DIGEST

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published for the large number of priests, religious, seminarians, and laity who are interested in present-day theological thought, but who perhaps find it hard to maintain and cultivate this interest. Besides the obvious difficulty that the literature appearing in many different languages is so extensive, there is the further difficulty that many important periodicals are not generally available.

THEOLOGY DIGEST aims to help such readers to keep informed of current problems and developments in theology by presenting a concise sampling of current periodical writings in theology. Articles are selected for their significance, interest, and digestibility, after a thorough examination of most of the theological journals in Europe and America. These articles are carefully translated and condensed so as to represent, accurately and succinctly, the thought and spirit of the original. For readers who wish to consult the originals for the documentation and detailed development necessarily omitted from digests and abstracts, THEOLOGY DIGEST can also serve as a guide to further reading and study.

The digests deal with the various branches of theological learning—Apologetics, Dogmatic Theology, Scripture, Moral Theology and Canon Law, Ascetics, Liturgy, and Church History—with emphasis on the speculative rather than the pastoral aspects of theology.

The opinions expressed in these digests are not necessarily those of the editors.

THEOLOGY DIGEST Staff: Editor: Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J.; Managing Editor: Wendell E. Langley, S.J.; Copy Editor: William H. Walsh, S.J.; Business Manager: Jerome E. Rohrer, S.J.; Associate Editors: Robert V. Callen, S.J.; Daniel T. Costello, S.J.; John H. Edwards, S.J.; Robert G. Gassert, S. J.; Edward F. Justen, S.J.; Joseph A. Ross, S.J.; John R. Sheets, S.J.; Clarence M. Wagener, S.J.

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published in the Winter, Spring, and Autumn of each year by St. Mary's College, the School of Divinity of St. Louis University. Subscription price in U. S., Canada, and countries of the Pan-American Union, $2.00. Foreign, $2.25. Single copies, 75 cents. Bulk subscriptions—10 or more—mailed to one address and distributed there, $1.50 per subscription. Foreign, $1.75.

THEOLOGY DIGEST is published with permission of ecclesiastical superiors, and all its contents are copyright by St. Mary's College, 1953.

Editorial address: THEOLOGY DIGEST
St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

Business address (subscriptions and change of address):
THEOLOGY DIGEST
1015 Central
Kansas City 5, Missouri

A Twofold Acknowledgement

In 1952 there appeared the first number of *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete,* a review published by Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, Stuttgart, with the cooperation of the Protestant and Catholic theological faculties at Tübingen. It is devoted exclusively to surveying current books and articles on biblical and allied subjects. This first issue lists 1,391 items.

This astonishing productivity is merely the external sign of a much deeper internal development: In the past fifty years Catholic scholars have elaborated a "biblical theology," a science which investigates the Word of God not merely to ward off attacks, but rather with help from modern science to grasp the inspired writer's intention and full meaning—to present the plan of the divine economy in its origin and development.

This progress has not been the result of mere chance nor of blind or disorientated impulse. As Father del Paramo witnesses, its initiation has been due to farseeing and penetrating scholars and to the Popes who guided and corrected these pioneer efforts. As Father Bea indicates, it has been built on the doctrinal heritage of the Middle Ages. Lastly, as Doctor Söhngen demonstrates, it is the result of the dynamic proclivity of apostolic preaching, the fulness of which is the constant goal of the Church's tradition of doctrine.

Liturgy has kept pace with these developments. Out of the exhaustive researches of more than half a century have come the concrete recommendations of the liturgical scholars who met at Maria-Laach. Their proposed changes in the Mass seek to recapture and revitalize for the worship of twentieth-century Catholics the age-old heritage of the Church.

This vitalizing influence has been felt in other fields as well. Our own day has seen the birth of a new science—missiology. With a deep realization of what is implied by the catholicity of the Church, the last three Popes especially have insisted that the missionary must not seek to westernize his eastern convert. Rather must the latter Christianize his own culture.

Catholic scientists are realizing that divine revelation has a positive contribution to make in synthesizing and interpreting their scientific findings. Professor Leonardi, for example, has constructed a theory of evolution which is deeply imbued with the principles of Catholic philosophy and theology.

Therefore, as this issue strikingly illustrates, *THEOLOGY DIGEST* has been made possible only by reason of the wide-spread and penetrating theological scholarship of the past fifty years. Without this activity, *THEOLOGY DIGEST* would have nothing to offer.

And yet, if the clergy and educated laity were not desirous of keeping abreast of current theological developments, this vast learning would remain in the heads of scholars and the racks of libraries.

The very existence of *THEOLOGY DIGEST* is, therefore, a twofold tribute: to the theologians and scholars who have been so active in investigating the mysteries of our faith and to our readers who wish a deeper appreciation of that faith.

Authors of Articles in This Issue

Fr. August Bea, S.J., is Professor of Old Testament at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. He is Consultor to the Pontifical Biblical Commission, to the Holy Office, the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities.

Fr. Jean Bruls, S.A.M., a recognized authority in missiology, has been the Editor of *Église Vivante* since its inception in 1949.

Fr. Walter Burghardt, S.J., is Professor of Patrology and Archeology at Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland, and Managing Editor of *Theological Studies.*

Fr. Th. Camelot, O.P., is Dean of Studies at Le Saulchoir, the Dominican House of Studies, Soisy-sur-Seine (S. et O.), France. He is a frequent contributor to *Vie Spirituelle.*

Fr. John J. Coyne, at present a chaplain in Liverpool, has become in the past few years a regular contributor to *The Clergy Review.* His most recent article, "Sacrifice and Sacrament," has just appeared in the January issue of the same review.

Msgr. H. Francis Davis is already known to readers of *THEOLOGY DIGEST* for his article on "The Priesthood of the Faithful." Besides being professor at Oscott College, Sutton Coldfield, Birmingham, he also lectures in theology at the University of Birmingham, where he is in contact with Protestants and current Protestant thought.

Fr. Severiano del Paramo, S.J., an acknowledged pioneer in the field of modern Catholic biblical scholarship, is Professor of Scripture at the Pontificial University of Comillas, Santander, Spain.

Fr. Francis X. Hecht, S.A.C., stationed at present in Limburg, Germany, is a frequent contributor to *Ephemerides Liturgicae.* He is also the German correspondent for the same review.

Dr. Bermudo Meléndez is Professor of Geology at the University of Granada in Spain. He is also Director of the Palaeontological Section of the Lucas Mallada Institute.

Professor Gottlieb Söhngen is at present Professor of Fundamental Theology at the University of Munich. He has frequently been sent as observer to Protestant ecumenical conferences. Many of the articles which grew out of these contacts have been collected in his latest work, *Die Einheit in der Theologie.*

Fr. Marc Thiéfry, S.J., stationed at the Collège du Sacré-Coeur, Charleroi, Belgium, is Professor of Sociology at the Institut Polytechnique of Charleroi. He is also chaplain of the Thomas More Society of Catholic lawyers of that region.

Progress in The Interpretation of Sacred Scripture

A. Bea, S.J.

One cannot minimize the importance of the relationship of theology and exegesis to each other. Father Bea traces the progress of exegesis through the centuries from the allegorism of the Alexandrine school to the ascendency of the literal sense, and shows how this progress in exegesis has been linked with progress in theology. This article appeared in Gregorianum, *33(1952), pp. 85-105, under the title "Il progresso nell' interpretazione della S. Scrittura."*

The history of biblical science and of the science of theology brings out the fact that both sciences are intimately connected, and that they influence one another reciprocally. The Roman Pontiffs, in their encyclicals concerning Sacred Scripture, point out that speculation which ignores the study of the sacred sources becomes sterile, while, on the other hand, biblical science without sound theology is fruitless.

Although the Word of God in Scripture is something immutably true, nevertheless, our understanding of it depends on many factors, both natural and supernatural. Progress in interpretation depends above all on the various elements which help the exegete to understand the meaning of Scripture. It must always be remembered that these elements, intellectual, spiritual, and material, are not something merely human, but rather that they are providentially arranged by the Holy Spirit to assist the exegete. Consequently, the interpretation of Scripture is really a divine-human work in which the action of the Holy Spirit and human labor are interwoven.

I. The Patristic Period

In the first centuries of Christianity, there was as yet no system of doctrinal truths distinct from the interpretation of Scripture. The attacks of the adversaries were aimed for the most part at the divine origin of the Christian religion, and against the relationship between Christianity and the Old Testament. Therefore, the theological battles took place in the field of exegesis. Against the Jews, it was necessary to show that beneath the letter was a *spiritual* sense. Against the Gnostics, it was shown that the spiritual interpretation of the Old Testament clearly demonstrated that the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New was one and the same. And against the pagans who accused the Christians of immorality, it was pointed out that the writings of Scripture were to be interpreted allegorically. Thus, because of the exigencies of the times, there arose the *allegorical* interpretation. The foremost exponent of this interpretation was Origen.

This Alexandrine allegorism, though useful for apologetics, remained sterile in the realm of theological doctrine. On the other hand, the fruitfulness of literal interpretation became more and more evident in the great theological controversies of the fourth century. The leaders of Catholic thought, Athanasius, Hilary, and Augustine (in his dogmatic works), followed for the most part the literal meaning. It is the great merit of the Antiochean School to have given literal

interpretation its deserved place without excluding the typical sense, which was not to be found, according to their "theory," in each and every passage. However, the circumstances of the times and the rationalism of some members of this school prevented it from exerting the influence it should have had.

Western Interpretations

In the West, allegorical interpretation generally enjoyed a certain preference. St. Jerome says that he tried to steer his bark "between history and allegory." St. Augustine, especially in his homilies, showed a predilection for the allegorical and mystical sense. St. Ambrose, who borrowed from Origen and Philo, definitely preferred the allegory. St. Gregory, searching for something profitable for pastoral work, looked chiefly for the moral and mystical sense.

To summarize, it can be said that patristic exegesis did not find the middle course between literal interpretation and allegory. Origen contemned the literal sense, and gave the spiritual (pneumatic) sense a value out of proportion to its worth. Though he attributed to the Old Testament a "glory" and a "gnosis" of its own, he nevertheless considered it as an intermediate stage, a preparation for the Gospel, something to be surpassed by the Gospel. As a matter of fact, this is just one of the senses of the Old Testament. For besides this typical (spiritual) sense, the Old Testament has a value of its own. The historical books show us God's inscrutable wisdom in ruling His people. Furthermore, there are doctrines which are expressed more completely in the Old Testament than in the New, and which are presupposed in the New; for example, the nature and properties of God, the origin and consequences of sin, and the prayer of the individual and the community. It is the task of the Catholic exegete to bring out the riches of the dogmatic and moral doctrine of the Old Testament, and to show its essential homogeneity with the New.

Though the Catholic exegete cannot overlook the typical sense, he should insist in the first place on the literal sense, which is the foundation of every spiritual interpretation.

II. The Interpretation of the Middle Ages

The great political, social, and cultural revolutions which accompanied the breakup of the Roman Empire led to the virtual extinction of exegesis. The restoration that gradually began in the Carolingian period contributed merely a few glosses of a grammatical, historical, and theological nature to the sacred text. Furthermore, the authors who were read, such as, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great, St. John Chrysostom, the two Gregories, and Origen, were rather favorable to allegorism. Hence, the biblical studies of the pre-scholastic period tended to prolong the ascendancy of the allegorical interpretation.

From the twelfth century on, there began to appear a greater interest in the literal sense. This interest was not due to the then more extensive study of Hebrew and Greek, the languages of the Bible, since these languages were studied for their value in philosophy, and in controversy with the Jews, but not for their value in theology. The interest in literal interpretation was due rather to that sense of realism which made its appearance with the rise of scholasticism. It was a realism which demanded knowledge of what the sacred author really said. St. Thomas, following St. Albert the Great, says that the literal sense is primary, and that it is the foun-

dation for the spiritual sense. He calls it that meaning by which words signify things.

Thus scholastic exegesis became a literal interpretation. Richard and Hugh of St. Victor turned it in this direction, and St. Albert and St. Thomas brought it to a high degree of development.

It must be remembered, however, that there is a great difference between the literal sense, as they presented it, and the way modern exegetes present it. The reason is that they lacked knowledge of the biblical languages, and did not have a text that was critically certain. But since their exegesis concerned itself with the principal truths of the faith, the text they had was generally sufficient for their purpose.

Emphasis on Theology

From the twelfth century, exegesis became more and more theological. Soon, in place of brief glosses on texts, a true theology was elaborated around a text. Naturally the theologians were more interested in those books of the Bible which were more useful for theological doctrine. Hence, the historical books of the Old Testament found few commentators.

These facts show the profound influence the interpretation of Scripture had on theology in the age of scholasticism. Moreover, the strong impulse which exegesis received from theology led to the triumph of the literal sense. But exegesis in turn opened up the treasures of revelation, providing material for dogmatic speculation. One cannot really claim to know St. Thomas unless he is familiar with his exegetical works. The gigantic edifice of systematic theology which he constructed was an organic combination of scriptural studies and speculative theology.

Thus the interpretation of Scripture in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with its emphasis on the literal sense and its development of biblical theology, made important advances. The shadows on the picture come from the fact that they did not have the original text, and that their attention was not given to the whole of Scripture. Furthermore, their explanations became too dialectic, with the evident danger of introducing opinions which were not those of the sacred author.

III. The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

After the death of St. Thomas there began a period of decadence in biblical studies. The only figure of prominence in this period is the Franciscan, Nicholas of Lyra (died 1340), whose commentary on the Old and the New Testament was reproduced many times until the sixteenth century.

The century which followed the Council of Trent is rightly called the "second golden age of Catholic exegesis." The Council itself gave the period its characteristic mark in prescribing scriptural research and in laying down the norm for keeping exegesis free from error, namely, fidelity to the interpretation of the Church. These prescriptions were made necessary by the conditions of the times: the so-called reform movement, humanism, and the textual difficulties in the Vulgate occasioned by the discovery of new manuscripts.

Catholic exegesis met the demands of the time with unparalleled energy. In the next century the names of over four hundred exegetes appear, among them Maldonatus, Estius, Toletus, and Bellarmine.

The progress in this period consisted chiefly in getting closer to the original text, and thereby coming to grips with the literal sense. But this contact with the original text was not as fruitful as first impressions might indicate. Not all

had an adequate grasp of the biblical languages; there was an excessive rigorism in interpreting the norms of the Council relative to the use of the Vulgate; much of their energy was absorbed in polemics; and, finally, many of them were far too diffuse in their explanations. However, these defects do not take away the value of their works.

IV. The Present Period

From the seventeenth century until the middle of the last century, Catholic exegesis was in a state of stagnation. Some of the reasons for this deplorable condition were the growth of rationalism, the rise of criticism, and the preference given to the natural sciences, and to patristic and historical studies.

The reawakening of Catholic exegesis in the last half of the nineteenth century resulted largely from outside stimuli. There was first of all textual and literary criticism, whose destructive force seemed irresistible. Then there was the growth of the science of philology of the Egyptian and Semitic languages, which allowed in many cases a more accurate determination of the meaning of scriptural words. The study of ancient literature showed that biblical literature has its counterpart, as far as genre is concerned, in other ancient literatures. Archeological discoveries contributed to a more comprehensive knowledge of the ancient peoples. In the realm of philosophy, the idea of evolution gave our generation the tendency to view things in their successive stages of development, not only in things that are material, but also in the development of ideas, institutions, and customs. Psychological research tried to get to the psychological lineaments of the author, to analyze psychic phenomena and to discover the author's intention. Finally, there was, as a reaction to materialism, a nostalgia for spiritual values.

Modern Systems

Anyone can see that these ma
terial, intellectual, and spiritual cir
cumstances of our times must hav
their effect on the interpretation o
Scripture. Outside the Church, th
effect has been to produce divergen
systems, each succeeding systen
burying the former, from the ration
alism of Kant down to the allegor
ism of some modern Protestant ex
egetes.

Within the Church, exegesis ha
not been attracted by those ephem
eral systems. However, there wer
those few who deserted to the cam
of the enemy, a fact attested by th
modernist theory of scriptural in
terpretation. But these, as well a
others who would like to turn back t
patristic allegorism, are exceptions
Catholic exegesis, guided by th
teaching authority of the Church
and particularly by the encyclical
of Leo XIII, Benedict XV, an
Pius XII on Sacred Scripture, ha
made immense strides in this las
half-century.

That which above all character-
izes modern Catholic exegesis is its
literalism. The exegetes of the past
did not have the extensive knowl-
edge of the ancient languages of the
modern exegetes. Furthermore,
while recognizing the juridical au-
thenticity of the Vulgate in all that
pertains to faith and morals, modern
exegetes go to the original text, the
immediate achievement of the sa-
cred author. The high development
of present-day textual criticism has
been a valuable instrument for de-
termining the literal sense.

The modern exegete, realizing
that the literal sense is what the
author intended to express, uses all
the various branches of knowledge
—science, psychology, history, etc.
—to determine the peculiar charac-
ter of the author, and thus to arrive
at the meaning intended in the
original.

In this manner, then, modern

exegesis can determine with more accuracy the true meaning of Scripture, and at the same time show the different phases of progress in divine revelation. The result is a more adequate knowledge of the divine economy which is revealed in Scripture.

Thus there has risen *biblical theology,* which is closely connected with exegesis. This science is not primarily concerned with finding arguments in Scripture for dogmatic truths. Rather, it aims at presenting, in a unified and systematic way, the origin and development of revealed doctrine in its successive stages. Thus, it takes individual truths out of their isolation and inserts them into a homogeneous system, which is not something artificial, but rather a system willed by God Himself. This is perhaps the greatest progress exegesis has made in the course of the centuries.

Importance

From this summary of the characteristics of Catholic exegesis, its importance to the theologian is obvious. In establishing the truths of the Faith, he needs scriptural arguments, which, as the Angelic Doctor says, can be drawn only from the literal sense. In the abundance of good Catholic commentaries, the theologian will generally find this work done for him. He should, however, be mindful of all the elements that help to discover the literal sense: the meaning of parallel passages, the interpretation as found in Catholic tradition, the "analogy of the faith," and finally, the teaching authority of the Church.

Progress in exegesis will, then, help the theologian in his scriptural argumentation when there is question of showing the development and the nexus of doctrines. Too often the pupil remains little satisfied with scriptural arguments because he does not have an adequate view of the place of that truth in the whole scheme of revealed doctrine. As a result, the Scriptures lack the fruitfulness which they should have in the spiritual life and ministry of the priest. But in order to reach the goal of presenting to the future priest a unified and organic view of revealed doctrine, the professor of Sacred Scripture needs the collaboration of his colleagues who teach theology. These latter should not content themselves with proposing some tiny scrap of a biblical text, but, guided by the research of exegetes, should strive to penetrate to the depths of the argument.

With such treatment, the scriptural argument will not be an emaciated skeleton, but rather will become spirit and life. In answer to the special needs of our times, divine providence has arranged an unparalleled progress in exegesis. It belongs to those who are called to train future priests to open to them the treasures contained in Sacred Scripture, with which they can nourish their own spiritual life, and effectively lead others to truth, virtue, and sanctity.

Our Saviour does not rule the Church directly in a visible manner, and so in carrying out the work of Redemption He wishes to be helped by the members of His Body. This is not because He is indigent and weak, but rather because He has so willed it for the greater glory of His unspotted Spouse. Dying on the Cross, He left to His Church the immense treasury of the Redemption; towards this she contributed nothing. But when those graces come to be distributed, not only does He share this task of sanctification with His Church, but He wants it in a way to be due to her action. Deep mystery this, subject of inexhaustible meditation: that the salvation of many depends on the prayers and voluntary penances which the members of the Mystical Body offer for this intention . . ." Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis.*

The BIBLICAL QUESTION
from Its Origins to Humani Generis

Severiano del Paramo, S.J.

While Humani Generis *is not specifically biblical in content, this encyclical does chart for us the shoals to be avoided and the course to be followed in the midst of the fog which has enveloped the problems of Scripture of our times. Father Paramo provides us with a retrospective and panoramic glance at the origin and changes of this problem within Catholic circles, and thereby brings into clearer focus the dangerous paths we learn about in the encyclical. This article appeared in* Estudios Eclesiásticos, *25(1951), pp. 435-473.*

I. Providentisssimus Deus

Since the Church teaches that inspiration extends to each and every authentic statement in Scripture, there can be no error in these statements. On the other hand, between some of these authentic assertions and the demonstrated conclusions of modern science, history, and criticism there arise certain apparently irreconcilable conflicts. Is there not a general hermeneutic principle, a system which will permit us at one blow to resolve all conflict between science and the Bible?

An old problem — Origen and Augustine and Jerome wrestled with it—it was not until modern times that this question was discussed in all its amplitude. During the last decades of the nineteenth century the methods of historical criticism, the discoveries of archeology, the rapid progress of the natural sciences, all seriously compromised the authority of the Bible and seemed to demolish the first chapters of Genesis. At first, theologians held fiercely to the traditional lines. Nevertheless, there were courageous spirits who pressed forward into new avenues of approach in search of a radical solution to this compromising situation, and thus there was founded what can be considered the "progressive" school.

First Attempts

August Rohling, writing in *Natur und Offenbarung* in 1872, restricted inspiration not only to matters of faith and morals but also, in historical matters, to those facts only which are the foundation upon which the whole religious edifice is built. But it is Francis Lenormand who must be reckoned as the foremost founder of the liberal school. In his well-known work, which appeared in 1880, Lenormand limited inspiration to matters which concern religion; for the rest, the human character of the sacred writers, influenced by the opinions and prejudices of their time, is left intact. Lenormand further distinguished between inspiration and revelation in the Bible; all is inspired but not all is revealed. Inspiration, moreover, does not exclude the use of profane documents or popular tradition. Relying on these principles Lenormand concluded that the first eleven chapters of Genesis contain the very ancient traditions common to the ancient peoples of Asia. There is nothing revealed by God in these chapters, but we can admit in them the influence of inspiration in so far as they eliminate all trace of polytheism and contain an elevated spiritual teaching.

Though Lenormand appealed to Cajetan for precedent, his work did not escape the Church's censure, and was put on the Index in 1887. His ideas, however, had already spread far and wide and had a profound influence in succeeding years.

A few years later, in 1884, Cardinal Newman presented his theory concerning the inerrancy of Scripture. Scripture, said Newman, is inspired with respect to such matters as the Councils of Trent and Vatican insist upon through the formula *in rebus fidei et morum*. But Scripture does contain certain *obiter dicta*, just as do the formal definitions of Pope or Council, which depend exclusively on the human element. That content of Scripture which refers to faith and morals must be distinguished from that which is scientific and historical; in this latter, especially, there is the possibility of *obiter dicta*, not subject to inspiration and not necessarily true.

In 1888, Salvador de Bartolo published his *I Criterii Teologici*. This work agrees substantially with Newman, though introducing new terminology by distinguishing three degrees of inspiration. The Barnabite P. G. Semeria defended the same teaching in a review in *Revue Biblique* for 1893. A year prior to this his brother in religion, P. Savi, developed similar ideas. In this same period Canon J. Didiot identified the infallibility of the Bible with that of the Church.

Institut Catholique

We thus see that the biblical question disquieted scholars everywhere. But the center of this new movement in the years immediately preceding *Providentissimus Deus* was in Paris, in the recently founded Institut Catholique. In 1882 the Rector of the Institute, Msgr. Maurice d'Hulst, attracted by the exceptional ability and promise of the young priest Alfred Loisy, obtained his appointment as Professor of Scripture. French Bishops soon began to show alarm over the destructive ideas of Loisy, and Msgr. d'Hulst, upon whose shoulders the responsibility for this state of affairs fell, believed it his duty to intervene. He published a long article in the *Correspondent* for January 25, 1893.

Msgr. d'Hulst undoubtedly showed himself excessively indulgent to the ideas of Lenormand and Loisy. Taking as his point of departure the principle that not everything in Scripture is revealed, although everything is inspired, he deduces the conclusion: "Perhaps this inspiration does not give the sacred author infallibility in all his assertions, but only in those which refer to faith and morals." This is, according to d'Hulst, the opinion of the new school, an opinion which rests on the end which God intended in inspiring the Scriptures and on the declarations of Trent and Vatican. Newman had restricted the extension of inspiration; the embarrassment of his position is eliminated by restricting not inspiration but inerrancy to matters which refer to the end for which Scripture is inspired. In applying the theory to the historical sections of the Bible we do not ask whether there is true history — evidently there is — but rather whether all apparent history, as the first eleven chapters of Genesis, is revealed as such or at least is endorsed by inspiration. d'Hulst ends his article by submitting beforehand to the judgment of the Holy See.

Rome Speaks

The agitation which this article provoked was enormous. The controversy which arose in reviews and periodicals had a strong repercussion in Rome, and Msgr. d'Hulst hastily betook himself to the Holy See to give his explanations to the Pope. Though d'Hulst managed to avoid a personal condemnation, nevertheless Rome spoke. On November 18, 1893, the same year, there appeared Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*. In it,

without naming names but in terms sufficiently explicit, the teaching of the new school is condemned and its tactics eschewed. The Encyclical defines the nature of inspiration and its consequent inerrancy in clear and precise terms. It also establishes a principle with regard to texts which refer in any way to the natural sciences: The Holy Spirit, in inspiring Scripture, does not pretend to inform men on matters which in no way pertain to eternal salvation; therefore, when the sacred authors speak of physical phenomea, they describe them merely as they appear to our senses.

As soon as the Encyclical was received in Paris, the professors of the Institute Catholique signed a letter of submission. Msgr. d'Hulst thought it his duty to add his personal submission. It was clear that the road attempted by the partisans of the progressive school was closed for Catholics.

II. Spiritus Paraclitus

The Encyclical, however, did not resolve all the problems discussed. As regards the field of history, especially, there yet remained ample room for discussion, and in the following years many efforts were made to find a general principle which would solve once and for all each and every historical difficulty.

The first was the theory of *historical appearances* advanced by Father Lagrange. This theory applies to history the principle which Leo XIII established for the natural sciences: The sacred writers in describing the facts of history were not interested in handing on to posterity what really took place, but rather what was believed or recounted to have taken place among their contemporaries. To investigate whether or not the facts actually happened belongs to critical history.

Parallel with the theory of historical appearances there arose among other authors the theory of *absolute and relative truth* first proposed by Loisy: The sacred books contain only an economic or proportional truth, relative to the times and places in which they were written. It is clear that with such teaching Loisy already belonged to the enemies of the Church. Some Catholics found no difficulty in admitting this distinction between absolute and relative truth, though in a sense quite different from Loisy's; others rejected the term as ambiguous.

In 1902 in *Études* Father Prat proposed his theory of *implicit citations*. The sacred authors, like ancient peoples generally, frequently took their information from written sources without indicating this fact explicitly or implicitly. In such cases the sacred writer does not himself assume the responsibility for the veracity of the cited documents. This principle was accepted by many authors as an expedient for answering difficulties. Others, principally Pesch, Schiffini, Delattre, and Dorsch, opposed it strenuously as arbitrary and full of dangers. The Pontifical Biblical Commission finally proscribed it on February 13, 1905, except in those instances in which it can be solidly demonstrated: 1) that the hagiographer actually cites the words or writings of another, and 2) that he neither approves nor makes these words his own.

Father Hummelauer: Literary Genres

All theories thus far examined have proved inefficacious. Such, then, was the situation when in 1904 there appeared the short work of Father Hummelauer, *Exegetisches zur Inspirationsfrage*. Gathering and synthesizing whatever is acceptable in the hypotheses already proposed, Hummelauer sets up three principles on which he builds his

system of hermeneutics. The most important is the first: We can distinguish in Scripture various literary genres of history, to each of which there answers its proper truth. Most interesting, from our point of view, is what Hummelauer says about the literary genres of ancient history, popular tradition, and free narration.

"Ancient History" he contradistinguishes from modern critical history. The historian of ancient times was a poet who certainly intended to recount what happened, but who conceived history as a work of art. His narration agrees in general with the facts, but in recounting them the historian moves with liberty. Thus, his work, taken as a whole, is true history; but when analysed in detail it is often hard to distinguish what is true from what is the fiction of the writer. Nevertheless, Hummelauer adds, the facts intimately connected with faith and morals are always true.

"Popular Tradition" is of wider application to exegesis, above all to the first books of the Bible. It has its origin in oral tradition and is found in primitive peoples still unacquainted with the art of writing. Such traditions are naturally transformed according to the circumstances and temperament of the generations which have passed. They contain an historical nucleus spontaneously revised by epic forms; it is in this historical nucleus that the truth of popular tradition must be sought.

"Free Narration," to which belong books like Ruth and Judith, can almost be confused with our historical novel.

From the examination and exposition of these and other literary genres Hummelauer establishes a canon of exegesis: The exegete has the sacred obligation of firmly defending the truth of all inspired narrations, but he also has the freedom to determine to what literary genre, with its proper truth, they pertain. He draws two conclusions: 1) certain books which up to the present have been considered historical *sometimes* belong to a genre which is not strictly historical but rather free narration; 2) the historical books of the Old Testament do not contain the truth of modern critical history but that of ancient history.

High Promise

Hummelauer was not the first to speak of literary genres in the Bible, but no other author had studied the problem so deeply or presented it in such an attractive and systematic form. The theory was immediately accepted by numerous Catholic biblicists of high repute; hence the high hopes nourished for the future of the theory.

The system, however, in the form and amplitude with which it was proposed, found strong opponents and was finally disapproved by Rome. Hummelauer had established a priori that no historical book of the Old Testament is historical in the proper sense of the word, and therefore, that all its statements do not necessarily answer to the objective reality of facts. The Pontificial Biblical Commission, in a reply of June 23, 1905, rejects this general principle and teaches that the books which have commonly been considered historical must be kept as such as long as the contrary cannot be proved with solid arguments.

Spiritus Paraclitus

As we see, the decree did not deny the possibility of proving that a book or narrative in the Bible is not really history. Hence certain Catholic authors continued, during the first twenty years of the present century, to favor the tendencies of the progressive school. Ecclesiastical authority had to intervene repeatedly to repress the boldness of some and the doubts and vacillations

of others. The authenticity of the Pentatuech, the author and veracity of the fourth Gospel, the Psalms, the synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St. Paul, each in its turn received the attention of the Biblical Commission. The Sacred Consistorial Congregation published a decree forbidding certain works to be included in the libraries of seminaries.

From these and other documents of the ecclesiastical magisterium we can realize how deeply and how extensively the principles of the progressive school had penetrated. Benedict XV, in his encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitus,* September 15, 1920, had once again to restrain the penchant for novelties which preoccupied many Catholic scripturists. This encyclical put an end to many controversies by authoritatively explaining the meaning of those expressions of Leo XIII which partisans of absolute and relative truth and of historical appearances had abused, and by bringing into relief the orientations of the Church on the principal biblical questions which had been matters of debate.

III. Humani Generis

There followed a period of relative calm. Meanwhile scriptural science was assiduously cultivated, and the resumption of excavations after World War I abetted this enthusiasm. The results in not a few cases strengthened the authority of the Bible, but also brought to light new problems urgently demanding answers.

The atmosphere in which many Catholic scripturists moved during these years is reflected in J. Coppens, professor at Louvain University. In 1938 this scholar published a series of articles on the critical history of the books of the Old Testament. Of paramount interest to us is the attitude which, according to Coppens, the Catholic exegete ought to have toward the decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. These decrees, he says, do not so restrict the exegete as to render impossible all further investigation. Thus he invites Catholic scholars to set to work without fear, although with a spirit submissive to ecclesiastical authority.

If one takes a good look, it is obvious that the decree of the Biblical Commission and the declarations of Benedict XV did not slam the door—indeed, they opened it—to further investigation. The decree on literary genres of history, for instance, proscribes the theory of Father Hummelauer as a universal panacea, but it admits its possibility in particular instances if proved with solid reason. It is not the principle, but its abuse which is condemned.

Today, in the light of *Divino afflante Spiritu,* September 30, 1943, we know to what particulars to confine ourselves. It is a universally admitted hermeneutic principal that in order to determine the meaning which the sacred writer intends we must first determine the literary genre he employs. These literary genres, the Encyclical adds, cannot be established arbitrarily nor a priori, but through patient and careful investigation; moreover, we must recognize that in these last decades we have advanced no little bit in our knowledge. With regard to history, especially, investigation has proved conclusively the exceptional merit of the Israelites over the other ancient oriental peoples. Therefore, the Pope counsels that Catholic scripturists consecrate themselves to serious study of these literary genres, building not on preconceived hypotheses but on solidly proved historical facts.

Letter to Cardinal Suhard

These prudent directives of Pius XII and the freedom of investigation he granted caused some to start

a new discussion on the authority of the Pentateuch and the historicity of the first eleven chapters of Genesis. From France, the main center of these tendencies, a question was proposed to the Holy See touching these two problems. The result was a letter which on January 16, 1948, the Pontifical Biblical Commission addressed to Cardinal Suhard. The letter recalls that "the replies of this Commission . . . are not in opposition to further truly scientific examination of the above problems in the light of investigation realized during the last forty years. There is no reason for modifying them, and they continue, therefore, in full force." The letter assures Catholic writers of the most complete freedom, within the limits of the Church's teaching, and invites them to study without bias the problems relating to the Pentateuch. The question of the literary forms of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, the letter continues, is much more obscure and complex. It counsels, therefore, much patience and prudence.

Humani Generis

This last counsel was forgotten by some who saw in the letter an open door for rashly launching into hypotheses contrary to points which the magisterium of the Church had already taught. *Humani Generis,* in those parts which refer to Scripture, helped in great part to repress these imprudent tendencies. With grave words Pope Pius XII deplores these deviations. Then, proceeding to the content of the letter on literary forms, he offers an authentic explanation of the words which had given rise to the wildest interpretations: The first eleven chapters of Genesis pertain in a real sense to history. This is not the genre of history as the Greek and Latin writers understood it, nor as do modern critical historians. But these biblical narrations do include real history, the literary and stylistic character of which must be determined by further investigation.

The Encyclical also recognizes the possibility of the sacred writers' having approved written documents or oral traditions. But if the sacred writer takes something from profane documents, he does so under the influence of inspiration which frees him from all error in choosing and judging these sources. We cannot put biblical narratives on an equal footing with those of other oriental literatures.

Science and Revelation

The Pope also teaches us the position we must adopt in the apparent conflict between Sacred Scripture and the positive sciences. Where there is question of actually proved conclusions the Church has always shown itself favorable to real scientific progress, since the truth of human wisdom cannot be in contradiction with divine truth. But where there is question merely of conjectures or hypotheses which touch the field of revelation, the scientific and prudent thing is to show great caution. And if there is question of hypotheses which directly or indirectly are in conflict with revelation, then it is clear that these cannot be admitted by a Catholic. The Encyclical itself offers two concrete applications of this general principle—evolution and polygenism.

New Senses of Scripture

In striving to eliminate all conflict between the Bible and modern science, some authors in our day have resurrected an error often condemned before: God is responsible only for the religious meaning of Scripture; this meaning is distinct from the fallible, literal, and human meaning, in which we must search out the religious and moral element. The Encyclical also deplores the

casualness with which certain modern authors prescind in their Scripture commentaries from the analogy of faith, patristic tradition, and the magisterium, thereby introducing Catholics to a merely human or scientific exegesis differing little from that of the rationalists.

Not less unfortunate is the tendency of other modern exegetes who want to substitute the symbolic and spiritual meaning for the literal. The Neapolitan priest Dolindo Ruotolo, particularly, devoted himself to the defense of a "spiritual" exegesis of meditation. Though his work has been placed on the Index and has been the subject of a special letter to the hierarchy of Italy, Ruotolo has left his impression in certain circles. His thought is all the more dangerous in proportion to the moderate language of its propagators, who purpose to find confirmation in the ancient Alexandrine school of allegory. In *Humani Generis* Pius XII again voices his reproof of this dangerous tendency. The true spiritual meaning of Scripture is that so highly recommended in *Divino afflante Spiritu,* an exegesis founded on Scripture itself and upon tradition.

Let no one think these discussions have been useless. They have contributed to the clarification of many concepts and to a more profound study of patristic traditions and the documents of the magisterium. They have been the occasion whereby we possess today a real treasure of truths orientated in the three magisterial encyclicals: *Providentissimus Deus, Spiritus Paraclitus,* and *Divino afflante Spiritu.* And as a very valuable complement to these, pointing out to us the dangers we must avoid, we now have *Humani Generis.*

SUBJECTS TO BE TREATED IN FUTURE ISSUES

St. Paul's Use of the Old Testament

The Origin of Man—a Catholic Theologian Examines the Findings of Science

Monophysitism and Devotion to the Sacred Heart

A New Mariological Interpretation of John 2, 4

Breviary Reform

Catholic Positions on Church and State

The Origins and Symptoms of Scrupulosity

The Social Function of Property

St. Paul's Teaching on Baptism in the Epistle to the Galatians

The Limits of Experimentation on Human Beings

The Covenant in the Old Testament

God and Nature in The Old Testament

John L. McKenzie, S.J.

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 14(1952), pp. 18-39, 124-145.

A study of the idea of God and nature in the Old Testament seems to show that the Hebrews shared the basic idea of pre-scientific man that nature was "personalized." They saw in the uncontrollable forces of nature evidence of the activity of a superior being. Other peoples of the Near East elaborated individual gods who were immanent in these forces of nature and circumscribed by them. But for the Hebrews, it was Yahweh who had dominion over all those forces. He was not contained in any of them, but transcended all.

It is important to realize that the Hebrews did not have a scientific concept of nature, as a closed system governed by laws, a *kosmos*, as the Greeks conceived it. The Hebrews had no philosophy of nature. They found in God what was abiding in the flux of things. The activities of nature were direct manifestations of the dominion of Yahweh.

Yahweh As Creator

Like the other ancient peoples, the Hebrews had the idea of a creative deity; but their idea of creation was distinguished by the absolute supremacy, independence, and unicity of this creative deity. Creation they saw as a continuing process, exhibited anew in any single phenomenon; for example in sustaining life, in providing animals with food, in daily bringing forth the host of heaven.

But the creative will is not arbitrary or capricious; its order and regularity the Hebrews saw as wisdom. Wisdom is a directive intelligence, which maintains order and harmony. God's Wisdom is something subjective, in the sense that it proceeds from Him, but it is also objective, in the sense that He employs it in the creation and conservation of the world. This idea of wisdom is the nearest approach in the Old Testament to a philosophy of nature.

Yahweh Lord of the Storm

As the creator, sustainer, and Lord of nature, Yahweh manifests Himself in natural phenomena. And while no area of natural forces is excluded from His domain, the Hebrews saw Him by preference in some phenomena and ignored His presence in others. Yahweh is often associated with the storm. The thunder is the voice of Yahweh. It is in a storm that Yahweh rescues His people from Egypt. He is also Lord of the earthquake; the mountains quake before Him, and the hills melt. It is as the helper of His people that Yahweh most frequently appears in the storm.

Fertility Cults

Man's sense of his dependence upon the divine is nowhere more apparent than in his quest for food. In ancient agricultural societies this sense developed into fertility cults. The forces of fertility were subject to the arbitrary will of some superior being, whose good will was sought in liturgical rites.

The pre-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine had an elaborate ritual, which dramatized the annual cycle of life from death. It is clear from the Old Testament that the Hebrews vigorously rejected this cult and the belief on which it was based, though not without a bitter struggle.

For the Hebrews, Yahweh is the dispenser of fertility, because He has dominion over all things. He is not a part of the process of fertility, as are the gods of the fertility cults. He has no female consort. In fact, the Hebrew language does not even form a feminine of the noun for deity.

Kingship of Yahweh

The kingship of Yahweh, a title brought out particularly in the Psalms, is associated with his reign over nature. The basis of the title is not merely His covenant with Israel, but also His creative dominion over all nature.

Nature and Divine Wrath

To other Semitic peoples, the anger of the gods manifested in nature was capricious, but for the Hebrews, the anger of God manifested in nature is punishment for infidelity to His covenant. For them the order of nature is integrated into the moral and religious order. A disturbance in the moral order has an inevitable effect in the physical order; God employs the order of nature to chastise.

Extraordinary Phenomena of Nature

The distinction between what is marvelous and what is miraculous presupposes an advanced concept of nature, which the Hebrews did not have. They

did not have the idea of miracle, of God intervening in a special way to produce an extraordinary effect beyond the competence of natural agents. They looked upon God as always acting through nature, though some of His actions were more marvelous than others. Of all the extraordinary events in Hebrew history, the most marvelous was the deliverance from Egypt.

Eschatological Consummation of Nature

In the mind of the Hebrews, the earth is conceived as sharing, in some mysterious way, the guilt of man. Therefore, in "the days of Yahweh" the earth will be obliterated. But this is merely a prelude to its messianic renewal. There will be a creation of new heavens and a new earth, in which all things work together for the benefit of man. There will be a perfect relationship between man and Yahweh, and consequently perfect harmony of nature.

Nature, therefore, was not conceived as a system unified by physical laws. The unifying factor was the dominion of Yahweh over all things. Nature was personified in the sense that they saw in the harmony of nature God's pleasure because they observed His covenant, and in the convulsions of nature, God's displeasure because they were unfaithful to Him.

NOVATIAN AND TERTULLIAN:
A Chapter in The History of Puritanism

C. B. Daly

The Irish Theological Quarterly, 19(1952), pp. 33-43.

Novatianist puritanism began as a protest against the Catholic practice of granting reconciliation to the apostates in the Decian Persecution of the third century A.D. Novatian maintained that the crime of apostasy was so heinous that apostates could never be reconciled to the Church. The crime of idolatry committed by apostates who had offered sacrifice was equated by Novatian with the sin of those who had procured or accepted certificates of compliance with the laws of sacrifice prescribed by the state.

Novatian may have held in theory, though he did not recognize in practice, that all grave sins are of equal malice and should receive the same penitential treatment. His successors, both in theory and practice, regarded all grave crimes as deserving perpetual excommunication from the Church. They held, as Tertullian had done, that all grave crimes are irremissible and that only God can forgive them. They imposed penance on those guilty of grave sins, as Tertullian had done, but this penance was life-long; it brought no hope of pardon.

The arguments with which the Novatianists sought to support this puritan attitude towards sin and sinners were very similar to those advanced by their great predecessor, Tertullian. There is abundant indication that the Novatianists went to the Montanist Tertullian for many of the principles of their puritanism, and for many of the arguments on which they based these principles. Montanism and Novatianism had a different origin and a distinct organization, but there was much correspondence in doctrine between them; much contact in their development; and, ultimately, a considerable fusion of membership between the two sects.

The solidarity between the two sects was largely due to the excessively austere attitude toward sins and the puritan condemnation of sinners which they held in common. This community view is to a large extent explained by the conscious assimilation by the Novatianist theologians of the doctrine of the greatest of the Montanists, Tertullian.

Novatianist puritanism has been represented by Liberal Protestant theologians as a protest against the new laxism of the Catholic Church, manifested in the novel decision to grant reconciliation to apostates. Harnack interpreted it as an attempt to return to the primitive puritanism which the Catholic Church by its spirit of compromise had betrayed, an attempt to return to the original concept of the Church as a "community of saints."

This hypothesis is completely refuted by a study of the penitential tradition of the African Church, as revealed in the teaching of Tertullian himself, before his lapse into heresy; in the teaching of the Catholic opponents of Tertullian's heresy; and in the teaching of St. Cyprian, who used the pre-Montanist teaching of Tertullian himself in arguments against the Novatianists in regard to the efficacy of the Church's penance.

The Catholic Concept of Tradition

Walter J. Burghardt, S. J.

This article, which is taken from the Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America *for 1951, pp. 42-76, and the one immediately following are grouped together because they illustrate the attention that Catholic theologians are focusing on the fundamental concept of tradition. It will be noted that both men are not in complete agreement. For Father Burghardt the only argument in theology is that from tradition, for even the Scriptures are "the Church's book." Dr. Söhngen, on the other hand, insists that since Scripture is part of apostolic preaching, it is imbedded in revelation itself; it gives objectivity to tradition. Scripture, therefore, is a source of apostolic doctrine which is distinct from* oral *tradition.*

The theological turmoil of the last decade is eloquent evidence that tradition is a crucial problem of our time. It is not simply that the *role* of tradition with respect to revealed truth is a source of dispute among Christians: that much we have recognized since the Reformation. Today it is the very *concept* of tradition that divides us.

George Barrois, writing in the *Christian Century* (68 [Jan. 17, 1951], p. 79), declared that the encyclical *Humani Generis* "discreetly" mantles the concept of unwritten tradition and instead emphasizes "the living teaching authority of the Church." H. Alivisatos, speaking as an Eastern Orthodox, remarks: "The Roman Catholic Church professes belief in the power of the Church . . . to create the Sacred Tradition, and . . . to pronounce new dogmas, even where there is no evidence for them in Holy Scripture or the Sacred Tradition" *(Ecumenical Review,* III [1950-51], pp. 154-55). And the Catholic patrologist Berthold Altaner concluded that a definition of the Assumption would be theologically indefensible, because there is no proof from Scripture and "a proof from tradition . . . cannot be adduced" *(Theologische Revue,* XLVI [1950], pp. 19-20). Clearly, a contemporary exigence is a precise understanding of the concept of tradition.

I should like to approach the problem in three stages. The first will be an *historical* survey of Catholic thought on tradition from Trent to our own day. The second, a *synthesis* of the best insights of Catholic theology into the idea of tradition. The third, an effort to relate the Catholic concept of tradition with "purely historical tradition," by clarifying the difference between historical and theological *method.* Finnally, the results will be concretized by an application to Our Lady's Assumption.

Historical Survey (1546-1951)

Let me submit that the theology of tradition since Trent falls broadly into three periods:

1. From Trent to the end of the seventeenth century we find *(a)* the emphasis on tradition as a source; *(b)* a parallel stress on the objective aspect of tradition, i.e., on the doctrine contained therein; and consequently *(c)* a distinction, implicit at least, between tradition and magisterium.

2. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there are no remarkable insights in regard of the fundamental concept, but there is *(a)* increasing insistence on a tradi-

tion that includes a living rule of faith; there is *(b)* a striking emphasis on tradition as itself a living, dynamic thing; and *(c)* the total Catholic theology of tradition, as it existed at the time of the Vatican Council, is summed up in Cardinal Franzelin.

3. The contemporary, twentieth-century theology of tradition *(a)* regards tradition not so much as a source, as rather the rule of faith; *(b)* it stresses the active aspect, the preaching of the Church, as the formal aspect; consequently *(c)* it insists upon identifying tradition properly so called and magisterium.

This progression of thought has been limned by Michel with a single bold stroke; the point of departure is the concept of tradition as *doctrine* received from the apostles; the end result is the concept of tradition as the Church's *magisterium;* neither concept, however, is exclusive of the other.

Tridentine teaching on tradition is inspired by a polemic. The Reformers insisted that Scripture is the sole source of our knowledge of Christian revelation, that tradition has no independent value. Trent answered: there are in the Church apostolic traditions; they are a source of divine revelation; as such they have authority equal to that of Scripture. More specifically:

1. Trent was interested in one aspect of tradition: a genuine source of revelation, no less than Scripture. Trent did not attempt a systematic treatment or scientific definition of tradition, did not lay claim to the ultimate expression of Catholic thought on the subject.

2. Trent speaks of "traditions" in the plural, i.e., objective tradition, truths concerning faith and morals revealed by Christ or the Holy Spirit and passed on as if by hand from age to age.

3. They are "apostolic" in the sense that the Apostles were their original recipients and the channel of their communication to the Church.

4. They are "unwritten," not in that they have never been consigned to writing, but in that the Church did not receive them from the Apostles through the medium of inspired writings.

5. They reach men of all times through the channel of the Catholic Church.

6. Finally, Trent distinguishes tradition and magisterium; tradition is a source on which the magisterium may draw.

For Melchior Cano (1509-1560), tradition as a locus is primarily, though not exclusively, a question of truths transmitted. Like the other loci, it is a source of theological knowledge, a source distinct from the authoritative preaching of the Church. And, as a distinct source, apostolic tradition is restricted to apostolic times. Actively, it is the personal doctrinal activity of Christ and the Apostles; passively, it is the doctrine itself, insofar as it is heard immediately from the lips of Christ and the Apostles. Tradition thus understood comes to an end with the death of the Apostles.

However, Cano does not cling slavishly to this restricted idea of tradition. He hints here and there that the activity of tradition is not limited to the Apostles; it is a function of the permanent living magisterium.

Briefly, in Trent and Cano all the elements are present for a definition of tradition: revealed truth, non-scriptural transmission, authoritative communication. But the synthesis is lacking. Toletus, Stapleton, Bañez, Vasquez, Suarez will insist, as did Cano, that tradition is doctrine, tradition is source. The magisterium enters in, yes; but it is not the direct, immediate object of attention. So, too, in the seventeenth

century, with Bellarmine, Adrian and Peter Wallenburg, and Bossuet: the stress is on tradition as *doctrine* handed down in the Church.

In the eighteenth century such theologians as Mayr, Gotti, Billuart, and Kilber insisted that tradition implies a living rule of faith. For each of them theological tradition is quite the same thing: a truth of faith or morals, received originally by the apostles from Christ or the Spirit, not consigned (at least expressly) to Scripture, but communicated to the Church and succeeding ages in a vital way. And yet, tradition, like Scripture, is not of itself a sufficient rule of faith. How determine genuine tradition? The judgment of the Church must intervene.

The contribution of the nineteenth century to the concept of tradition may be summarized in three names: Möhler, Newman, and Franzelin. Möhler (1796-1838) distinguished two aspects of tradition, objective and subjective. "Tradition in the objective sense is the universal faith of the Church throughout all centuries, embodied in outward historical testimonies." This deposit admits no change. Tradition in the subjective sense is the Church's consciousness of this faith. It is "the peculiar Christian sense existing in the Church and transmitted by the pedagogy of the Church." It is this tradition that can develop, precisely because it is not simply the word of God, but the word of God "living in the hearts of the faithful." But since such tradition can develop, there is need of a visible, living authority, to protect progress against deviation. Precisely because of the active role exercised by the authoritative Church, development is a meaningful evolution, not a mere corruption of primitive Christianity.

Like Möhler, John Henry Newman (1801-1890) accented the dynamic element of life and growth in Christian doctrine. There is a striking resemblance, too, between Möhler's subjective and objective tradition and the distinction which the Newman of the *Via media* introduced between episcopal and prophetical tradition. This prophetical tradition is St. Paul's "mind of the Spirit," the Church's "accustomed and unconscious mode of viewing things," rather than any systematic collection of dogmas elaborated by the intellect. This prophetical tradition is too subtle a thing to be transmitted sheerly by word or writing. It is a genius, a spirit, a life, elusive yet real, difficult to define yet readily recognizable, in consequence of which the members of a social group conform their ways of thinking and acting to a single model.

Cardinal Franzelin (1816-1886) marks an end and a beginning. His treatise on tradition and Scripture summed up the Catholic theology of tradition as it existed at the time of the Vatican Council, and his work was the framework for future development. Franzelin's merit is twofold: he distinguished, more clearly than had been done in the past, the active and objective aspects of tradition, and set in strong relief the role of the living magisterium.

Objective tradition is, for Franzelin, the doctrine transmitted; active tradition is the ensemble of acts and means whereby the doctrine is transmitted. The two aspects should be distinguished; they cannot be separated. But in treating of tradition and its authority we should deal less with truths transmitted than with the mode and organ of transmission. The primary question is not: Have revealed truths come down to us that are either totally absent from Scripture or at least not totally intelligible from Scripture? The primary problem is: Did Christ institute another instrument

besides Scripture to preserve and propagate revealed doctrine with at least equal assurance? And so Franzelin concentrates on the discovery of an authentic, living, perpetual, divinely-guided magisterium, in whose hands even the Scriptures are but an instrument.

A glance at the post-Franzelin textbooks on tradition leads to three broad conclusions. (1) Active tradition is identified with the preaching of the magisterium from apostolic times to our own day. (2) Passive or objective tradition is the doctrine thus transmitted; frequently this doctrine is restricted to truths not contained in Scripture. (3) Active tradition is a rule of faith.

However, in view of a tendency at the turn of the century to see in tradition a sheerly remote rule of faith, and to find in the magisterium the proximate rule, a work of correction and precision was in order. The necessary nuances were achieved almost simultaneously by Billot (1904) and Bainvel (1905).

Cardinal Billot (1846-1931) explained that tradition—the Church's continued, indefectible preaching of the original revelation — can be looked upon in two ways. *In its past,* as the transmission through the centuries of the doctrine received from Christ and the apostles, it is constituted concretely by ecclesiastical records. This past teaching of the Church is a rule of faith, but a remote one, because it involves a scientific study of the past. As it exists *here and now,* tradition is envisaged under the precise formality of the authoritative magisterium clearly proposing and explaining what must be believed in accord with the revelation inherited. Under this formality tradition is the proximate rule of faith and is adequately and completely identified with the ever-living magisterium, considered formally as magisterium.

August Deneffe takes essentially the same position as Billot (so, too, do Ranft, Michel, and Filograssi). Dogmatic tradition, in its primary meaning, is the infallible preaching of the faith, exercised by the living magisterium; this is the proximate rule of faith. The magisterium of a later date, while conscious of the documents of the earlier magisterium, always draws its doctrine ultimately from its very self. For the Church is numerically one today, yesterday, and tomorrow, though the physical persons be different.

Synthesis of Doctrine

So much for the historical survey. As an outgrowth of the progression of thought we may now venture a synthesis. Tradition is in essence the preaching of the Church. In this concept there are three elements: (1) the doctrine preached, (2) the preacher, and (3) the act of preaching.

The *doctrine* preached is always the same: the truths originally communicated to the apostles by Christ Our Lord, or by the Holy Spirit.

The *preacher* is primarily, directly, and officially the teaching Church, the magisterium regarded as a body of men, the apostles and their successors down the ages. The teaching of the official Church can be conserved and manifested in various ways: in the writings of the Fathers and theologians, in the consciousness and consent of the faithful, and in the liturgy. But the ultimate teacher is the teaching Church.

The *act of preaching* is the actual exercise of the teaching function of the Church, the magisterium *qua* magisterium. It is the actual communication by the apostles or their successors of what is to be believed or done according to the revelation of Christ or the Holy Spirit. The precise method of communication will differ with time and circumstance (letter, radio, television). The one method that matters is this: In tradition the doc-

trine is transmitted and communicated in a way other than Scripture. The essential is the activity of the teaching Church.

Tradition, then, is the communication by the teaching Church of the revelation made by Christ and His Spirit to the apostles. But from the very nature of the Church's commission, and by reason of her continued existence in time, tradition is not exhausted by a single act. Tradition involves continuity: continuous preservation and continuous presentation. Tradition is not confined to the past. To recognize this is to recognize the uniqueness of tradition, its function, its dynamism. In tradition there is life, because in tradition there is growth and progress: growth in the Church's consciousness of her possession, progress in the presentation of that possession to men. What makes tradition a living thing is not simply that the communication is (or may be) vocal; it is that the communication is vital, that the preaching of Pius is not sheer verbal repetition of the preaching of Peter, not a mere echo of Scripture. The teaching Church, *as such,* does not look to the past; the teaching Church looks within, to her own living consciousness of the doctrine confided to her and nourished within her by the Spirit of Truth.

Let me indicate briefly several consequences that follow hard upon this Catholic notion of tradition.

Tradition and revelation. Properly speaking, there is only one source of faith, and that is revelation. But revelation has been handed down to us in two ways, by inspired writing and living preaching. Under this aspect of the *method* of transmission, we may speak (less properly) of two sources of faith.

Tradition and magisterium. Tradition, in its primary meaning, is not something that exists prior to the preaching of the Church. It *is* the preaching of the Church. Active tradition and the magisterium in action are one and the same thing.

Tradition and Scripture. Tradition and Scripture are adequately distinct as two different ways of transmitting the revelation of Christ, i.e., by inspired writings and by divinely-directed pronouncements of the teaching Church. However, there is a sense in which they are not adequately distinct, a sense in which tradition may be said to include Scripture. The viewpoint here is the matter involved, the revelation itself. For the Church teaches Scripture too. Scripture is not something that hangs in the air, to be grasped by all and sundry. It is the Church's book. She received it and she owns it; in fact, she wrote it. Only she can tell us what is Scripture and what is not; only she can tell us authoritatively what it means. Billot did well to remind us that it is not in Scripture but in tradition alone that revelation has been integrally deposited. The deposit of tradition contains even written revelation in some way; and if *even* written revelation, then the whole of revelation.

A final conclusion is significant for theological method. Magisterium, Scripture, Fathers, theologians are not four adequately distinct theological "proofs." Actually the sole legitimate theological method is the argument from tradition, from the preaching of the Church. The argument from the magisterium is an argument directly from the Church's preaching, directly therefore from tradition. The argument from the Fathers and theologians is only an argument from tradition in an indirect way, for the Fathers and theologians derive their doctrine from the preaching of the Church, from tradition. To argue from Scripture, not as a polemist but as a theologian, is to argue from tradition, for it is the Church's task

to tell us what Scripture means. Scripture is the Church's book, and her interpretation of it is her intelligence of the revelation of Christ. An argument from Scripture is theologically an argument from the Church's understanding of her own book; and that is an argument from tradition.

Tradition and Historical Method

A final word on the difference between theological and historical method, i.e., between the Catholic concept of tradition and "purely historical tradition." The problem is this: How do we go about discovering what the Church has taught and believed in the past? Take a concrete question: How are we to discover what the Church has taught and believed through the ages about the final lot of the Mother of God?

For that discovery theology and history have the same evidence at their disposal: acts of councils, writings of Fathers, liturgy, epitaphs, and the rest. The methods of approach, however, are poles apart. The historian deals with the evidence in the light of sheer historical principles, sheer human reason. He investigates and explains the documents in the light of facts and the principles of historical criticism. The theologian, on the other hand, investigates the same documents in the light of faith and of the Church's doctrine—especially the doctrine of the Church here and now. I do not mean that the theologian falsifies the evidence; that he puts into a document what was never there; that something can be proved true historically and false theologically. I mean simply that the theologian has another and more powerful instrument with which to read and understand the evidence, with which to supply for the uncertainty and even lack of evidence. I mean specifically that the teaching and belief of the Church today is an indispensable guide to the teaching and belief of the Church of yesterday that the tradition which is *Munificentissimus Deus* (1950) may well throw light on the relatively few monuments, the rather obscure documents, that remain from patristic times.

Historical method, dealing with the past, begins and ends with the documents of the *past*. Theological method, seeking to determine the tradition of the early Church, may legitimately begin with the *present*. For the ancient doctrine of the Church lives on in the living magisterium of today. To discover whether the early Church taught the Immaculate Conception, the historian will have recourse to the monuments of Christian antiquity and perhaps conclude that the primitive Church did not possess that truth, did not preach it. The conclusion would be wrong. The conclusion should be: There is inadequate historical evidence to show that the primitive Church preached the Immaculate Conception. The theologian is not so limited. The theologian may licitly begin with the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* of 1854; as a result of that pronouncement he knows for certain that the Immaculate Conception was preached by the Church through the ages. Not explicitly; certainly there was evolution. He may not be able to put his finger on that preaching. But he knows infallibly that it was there, that it was always there, that consequently there is an unbroken dogmatic tradition on the Immaculate Conception.

The Assumption is a case in point. Professor Altaner has done a masterful work on the Assumption monuments of the patristic era. It would be difficult for an historian of Christian antiquity to have handled the evidence with a finer critical sense. From the viewpoint of the historian, Altaner has merited well of Assumption scholarship.

Where is the chink in Altaner's armor? In this: Altaner has tried to discover the teaching of the Church, dogmatic tradition, by a sheerly historical method. He has examined the evidence for a belief in the Assumption in the patristic era. His conclusion: In the first eight centuries no trustworthy historical tradition is extant. Had he stopped there, few theological nerves would have been touched. But he added: Therefore no proof from tradition can be adduced. More than that: Since there is no tradition in the first eight centuries, there can be none in the next twelve. Since no tradition is demonstrable, the definability of the Assumption cannot be maintained from the standpoint of scientific theology.

But that is not the theological method. A valid argument for a dogmatic tradition, for the Church's teaching in the past, can be constructed from her teaching in the present. And that is actually the approach theology took to the definability of the Assumption before November 1, 1950. It began with a fact: the current consensus, in the Church teaching and in the Church taught, that the corporeal Assumption was revealed by God. If that is true, if that is the teaching of the magisterium of the moment, if that *is* the Church's tradition, then it was *always* part and parcel of the Church's teaching, part and parcel of tradition. And that, understandably enough, is what the Bull of definition actually asserted: We know that the Assumption is revealed truth, because the whole Church believes it.

Given the fact of present-day unanimity, then the theologian goes back to the past. He discovers explicitly-taught dogmas that contain the Assumption implicitly. More than that, the consensus of the Church today throws light on the rare remains of patristic times, illumines the relatively few references to the Assumption in antiquity. It even assures us that the Christian sense, the Christian consciousness, as reflected in the apocryphal *Transitus* accounts, was fundamentally sound. The apocrypha, of course, are valueless as history, but in the light of the current consensus of the Church, in the light of the definition of the Assumption, they are priceless witnesses to the fundamentally sound Christian feeling of the faithful for Mary, and, indirectly, priceless witnesses to the preaching of the Church, to tradition.

THE MISSIONARY'S CRY ACCORDING TO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

André Retif, S.J., "Le cri du missionaire d'après les Actes des Apôtres," Église Vivante, 3(1951), pp. 5-24.

The preaching of God's word, whether by the prophets, the Baptist, or Christ Himself, manifests a fourfold type of publicity: 1) material, or the actual truth to be publicized; 2) intentional, or the deliberate and effective will to publicize the truth; 3) symbolical, or the actual preaching to a particular group that is really representative of a vast number of individuals; 4) kerygmatic, or spiritual publicity. Kerygmatic means the public and solemn proclamation of the truth of salvation through Jesus Christ, preached in God's name to the non-christians, and accompanied by sensible and powerful signs that engender, in souls well-disposed to conversion, a return to God. Kerygmatic publicity contains the elements of the species of publicity given above, and is the type of publicity that is particularly in evidence in the Acts of the Apostles. Since Christ's missionary today is guided by the same Holy Spirit, it is not surprising to find Church documents especially *Maximum Illud* and *Rerum Ecclesiae*, exhorting her missionaries to lay particular stress on kerygmatic or spiritual publicity of God's truths.

TRADITION and APOSTOLIC PREACHING

Gottlieb Söhngen

This paper originally appeared in Episcopus: Studien über das Bischofsamt *(Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1949, pp. 89-109), a group of studies in honor of Cardinal von Faulhaber. It has since been reprinted in Dr. Söhngen's most recent book,* Die Einheit in der Theologie.

"The Bishops are the successors of the Apostles." This statement includes: 1) an element pertaining to the *person* holding the office—the office of bishop derives from the office of apostle; 2) an objective element—the Bishops are custodians of the apostolic deposit of faith. This double assertion includes the Bishop of Rome, the successor of the Prince of the Apostles and the Bishop of Bishops.

The Bishops are therefore the official bearers of the apostolic tradition. By apostolic tradition I understand the tradition which has its source in what was preached for the first time by the *Apostles* by the *divine commission* of their Lord and Master (Rom. 10:17). As a result, what they were passing on was *His* teaching and *His* precepts. The Lord had made the Apostles His voice (Rom. 10:16-18). We believe *in* the Lord Jesus Christ; but *that* there is a Lord Jesus Christ and *what* He did for us and spoke to us, we believe by reason of the Apostles and their teaching. Whether that teaching be oral or written makes no difference in its apostolic worth. This difference is important only when we consider the *post*-apostolic transmission of what the Apostles taught.

I. What is "Apostolic"?

The fundamental question in a critical theology of tradition is this: How can *post*-apostolic tradition still claim to be *apostolic* tradition? Since apostolic tradition and apostolic succession go together, to answer the question we shall have to discover what is "apostolic" in the apostolic succession.

The Bishops are the successors to the Apostles yet are not Apostles. The Pope is successor to a particular Apostle, St. Peter (and consequently possesses the entire fulness of the episcopal power). Yet, the Pope is not an Apostle.

In order to define the specific note "apostolic" in relation to tradition of doctrine, let us consider more carefully the question: What is the fundamental distinction between the preaching of the Apostle and the "tradition" of his successor?

The concept of Apostle has been authoritatively developed by St. Paul (2 Cor. 2-3; 6:3-4; Rom. 11:13; Acts 1:25; 6:4). At the birth of the new era (2 Cor. 5:17) the Apostle appears with the claim to be the messenger of God's peace, to mediate peace for men with God, and as ambassador of Christ to announce and effect the "new creation in Christ." And with such authority is the Apostle and his preaching endowed by God that Paul can write to the Galatians (1:18): "But though we, or an angel from heaven preach a gospel unto you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." In the Apostle it is Christ who speaks (2 Cor. 13:3).

II. The Apostle Preaches as an Eye-Witness.

What, then, is the place which the Apostles occupy in regard to tradition? The answer: The preaching of the Apostles stands midway between "proclamation" and "transmission."

1. By "proclamation" I understand the revelation made by the Lord Himself. For the preaching of Jesus is in no way a tradition, but entirely a revelation; He is preaching the truth of God because He *is* the Truth itself (John 14:6); He Himself is God actually revealed.

2. Ecclesiastical "transmission," on the other hand, is a preaching of doctrine whose *whole inner essence* consists in its being handed on. Jesus' proclamation marks the beginning of the Church's work. Here she must find her life and origin.

3. Between Our Lord's preaching and ecclesiastical tradition lies the preaching of the Apostles. They are not links within the chain of tradition; rather, with them the chain has its beginning. The Apostles are the source of tradition, for they preach what they have *seen*. Furthermore, what they have received from the Lord is not tradition but immediate revelation itself. The Apostles are the first witnesses of the revelation itself, and not of a tradition.

Was Paul an Apostle?

A difficulty arises concerning Paul. Was he witness to the revelation made by Jesus?

According to the specifications demanded by Peter before the election of the substitute Apostle Matthias (Acts 1:21, 22), an Apostle should be a witness of the *resurrection* of the *terrestrial-historical* Jesus; he should be able to bear witness with his own eyes to this truth: "Jesus is the Christ." Is not Paul rather a disciple who, after the departure of Jesus, joined His following through contact with the Apostles? Is he not rather within the chain of tradition?

Had Paul received all his knowledge from the Apostles, such would be the case. However, as Paul himself emphasizes, the factor distinguishing his apostolate is the reception of an immediate revelation from Christ. The calling of Paul to the apostleship and to the preaching of the Gospel is not to be separated from revelation; both his call and his knowledge are from revelation. Therefore Paul had the full commission of an Apostle: "The Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man; for neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:11 ff.).

This is clear from the subject matter of Paul's preaching; he testifies to what he has *seen*. As he has not seen nor heard the life and teaching of Jesus, he does not compose sermons on this subject. Nevertheless, he has, so to speak, seen Christ's work of salvation — the death and resurrection of the Lord, the *key* to the mystery of Christ's life and teaching and to the meaning of Scripture. Hence, he preaches the Christ he has seen—the Crucified who lives as the Lord of glory.

Thus the reason why Christ placed the Church on the foundation of the Apostles is greatly clarified by studying Paul. Merely to spread "the life and teaching" of Jesus would not have required "Apostles" in the New Testament sense. Any disciple could have been able to perform that task just as well. But since the decisive consummation of the life and teaching of Jesus lies only in what happened *after* it, namely the Resurrection of the Crucified and His sending the Holy Spirit, then to

bring to us that climax it was necessary to have specially appointed witnesses to that revelation.

The Apostle Witnesses the Revelation Which is Christ

Without the Apostles and their preaching, the revelation of Jesus Christ lacks its conclusiveness for us. Without the Apostles and, above all, the Apostle Paul, the unique figure of Jesus Christ the Redeemer would have straightway turned into the eminent but undistinguished figure of a wise teacher, lawgiver, and wonder-worker, a founder of a new religion; and his disciples would then ultimately have had to be compared with the "preachers of new gods" (Acts 17:18). The relationship of the "Apostle" to the "Lord" is not the ordinary disciple-master relationship familiar to the student of the history of religion. The disciple remains outside the event of the revelation since this has come to a conclusion in the Master; the disciple "hands on" the revelation which the Master has received. The Apostle, on the other hand, stands personally within the event of revelation and even brings it to a close for us. The Apostle is himself a recipient and witness of revelation and thus—with Christ as the first beginning—is the source of a tradition whose first bearers and witnesses will be those who follow after the Apostles. For Jesus Christ is no mere teacher who has simply received a revelation; He is in fact the revelation itself, the revealed God Himself.

Consequently, in the language of our theology we say: Tradition and the meaning of Scripture take their form within the preaching of the Apostles under the inspiration and prompting of the Holy Spirit. The theology of an Apostle is *inspired* theology, and this differentiates it from all succeeding theology.

Now the relation between revelation, preaching, and tradition can be more accurately determined.

III. Revelation, Tradition, and Apostolic Preaching.

1. *Apostolic preaching and revelation*: Apostolic preaching belongs to the actual process of the revelation of Christ as the form of that preaching. The revelation *is* Christ —Christ crucified, Christ risen, Christ glorious.

To separate apostolic preaching from divine revelation is to fall either (a) into the enthusiasm of a continuous revelation, a completely new experience of Christ, or (b) into the over-simplification of a purely "historical Jesus." The apostolic testimony, on the contrary, admits "Jesus the Christ" (I John 5:1; John 20:31), and means thereby the actual identity of the Christ of faith with the Jesus of history. From this unity of the God-man in the order of faith there proceeds in the order of knowledge the union of the eye of history with the eye of faith.

Only both eyes together can perceive in full, new-testament perspective the history in the divine mystery of faith, and can penetrate to the mystery of Christ through the *historical reality* which sets off mystery from myth.

2. *Apostolic preaching and tradition*: The apostolic preaching is imbedded in revelation. From this note proceeds its second basic characteristic: The preaching of the Apostles is the source for tradition. Indeed, the preaching of the Apostles is the source in its fulness, and thus, once for all, the untransferable source of the Church's tradition of doctrine. What the Spirit of truth had still to say to the Apostles after the Lord's departure to the Father, He revealed to them; He taught them the whole truth. The same Spirit of truth assists His Church and the Bishops appointed by Him

as successors of the Apostles to preserve the apostolic deposit of truth and to transmit it to every people in every age.

Hence, post-apostolic tradition has never been able to sever itself from or add to its apostolic source. In non-severance and non-augmentation as well as in acceptance and transmission is founded the claim whereby ecclesiastical tradition can be called, and can actually be, *apostolic* tradition. This tradition, correctly understood, is something which comes down from the Apostles as source, and which operates *according to* the apostolic doctrine, and in this sense actually passes from hand to hand *after* the Apostles.

A teacher who knows something from his own experience does not pass on a tradition. Tradition begins with his pupils. The Apostles teach Christ from their own experience.

Thus the New Testament Scriptures belong immediately to apostolic preaching and are within the revelation of Christ. Holy Scripture is a *source* of tradition. We indeed, *receive* Scripture through tradition. This, however, affects not the order of being, but the order of *knowledge*.

3. *Apostolic preaching is the object of tradition*: As source, apostolic preaching is the independently existing reality, the *exemplary and regulating object* of all ecclesiastical tradition. As object, it is distinct both from the act whereby the object is apprehended (active tradition) and the content of that act (passive tradition).

Apostolic doctrine became and is the content-of-consciousness in the Church's teaching. But it does not on that account lose itself in that consciousness; it remains the distinguishable object which forms the content of this consciousness. Without constant return to apostolic teaching, the point of departure and the final goal, the content of the Church's consciousness would lose meaning and truth.

Tradition, therefore, cannot be (as Drey understood it) the living self-transmission of the events of primitive Christianity to the constant present. These events, the reality of revelation, are rather the object which moves all that comes after it, itself unchanged and unprogressing. What does progress is our understanding and the expression of our understanding in the defense and attestation of the common faith.

Scripture and Tradition

Hence we can see why over and above oral tradition, we possess in Scripture another self-existent source for our knowledge of revelation. Without the written word, the objectivity of the apostolic teaching would vanish into pure data of magisterial consciousness.

Thus Scripture and tradition complete each other. Tradition needs objectification through the written word, for what would tradition be without clear and significant objectivity? Writing for its part needs vivification through the spoken word of tradition if its objective spirit is to speak to us in the constant present. For what would Scripture be if the original spirit of its words were not made to live here and now?

Why Not Keep Our Latin Liturgy?

John J. Coyne

Perhaps the most discussed question today among those interested in more active participation of the laity in the liturgy of the Church is the question of the use of the vernacular. Fr. Coyne here presents several significant arguments in favor of keeping Latin. These arguments are valuable in that they are based on sound understanding of the history and the doctrine of the Mass. This article is taken from The Clergy Review, *37(1952), pp. 138-151.*

The increasingly prominent awareness of the doctrine of the Mystical Body has been accompanied by a deeper appreciation of the liturgy, and particularly of the Mass, its central act. Everywhere attempts are being made to impress on the faithful the fact that they should be active participants in the Holy Sacrifice. Congregational singing at High Mass, the Missa Dialogata, encouraged use of the missal, liturgical weekends, and study circles have all been employed with this same objective in view.

Reasons for Vernacular

Many believe that a wider use of the vernacular in liturgical ceremonies would have a marked effect for good because it would enable the people to live the liturgy. This, they believe, would prevent the lapse of many Catholics and win back England to the Faith. They point out the enormous effect which the Book of Common Prayer has had on English life for over three centuries. They conclude that nothing is intrinsically opposed to ecclesiastical practice in the adoption of the vernacular since Latin was once a vernacular, and since today there are many vernacular liturgies in the Eastern Church.

However, of those who desire so striking a change we are tempted to ask what precisely are the circumstances which appear to have made such an innovation desirable; and what precisely is the value of the reasons drawn from historical and other sources in support of such a change.

To deal more fully with the circumstances, the first question to be answered relates to the special difficulties of our own time—the fact that many are Catholic in name only, or are at least passive rather than active. For some Mass seems no more than a hieratic and remote ceremonial at which they are bodily present without prayer or devotion. Not understanding, they do not pray the Mass. They have no idea of the wealth of meaning of the Church's prayers in the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals.

Mass is Action

Granting this state of affairs, we answer in the following manner the question of whether the vernacular liturgy is the only or even the best means of improvement. Many have an understanding and appreciation of the Mass and the sacraments not because they worship in English, but because (at least in the case of the Mass) they have been taught the meaning of the *action*. Frequent attendance, aroused interest, and use of a translation do allow the *action* to become a personal acquisition for the faithful. The Mass is not a mere prayer service, nor is it dependent on language alone, but it is an action, and can be understood and

appreciated as it is. Taught its meaning and trained in the use of a simple missal, the faithful will assist intelligently. In the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals many priests repeat part of the prayers and blessings in English. But why say it twice? some will ask. Use the English form to actually confer grace.

If there are good reasons for retaining the present forms, and if the faithful receive the graces and blessings and understand what is being done, why should we change? There is nothing unseemly in repeating a Latin prayer in English. Many of the ordinary faithful would not be particularly grateful for the introduction of a vernacular for which they never asked. Even the argument of "more conversions if an English Liturgy" loses value through its denial by many priest-converts from the Anglican and Nonconformist ministries.

Presumably before any change, the case for the vernacular would have to be urgent and proved. The Church does not easily change century-old customs, yet the rule concerning rites and liturgies does admit of possible dispensation. This attitude ought to influence us in seeking first for less radical solutions of our problem.

This brings us to the other question. Would a vernacular liturgy produce all that its promoters hope for? English rites without frequent instruction would not intensify personal devotion or a more intelligent following of service. Nor would conversions necessarily be made easier. Some converts lament the loss of English services, but many others prefer the Latin.

History of Latin Liturgy

Today, as in ancient times, missionaries introduce a Latin Liturgy which is intelligently followed by their untutored neophytes. Why should it then be so difficult for the presumably better educated Catholic at home? English liturgy exponents propose arguments from historical and other sources which are not a true parallel to the case under discussion. Although it is true that Latin was a vernacular when adopted for the liturgy, ecclesiastical policy and practice have very much changed since its adoption. From the fourth century onwards the liturgies became stabilized, and when Latin yielded to the romance languages in daily speech, the liturgical form remained in Latin. The reasons? The same formulated by Trent more than a thousand years later—the widespread use of Latin in the liturgy already obtaining; reverence for the sacred mysteries; fear lest any error might be introduced in translations.

Although not only Protestants but also many Catholics demanded a vernacular liturgy, the fathers of Trent rejected these demands in the famous canon 9. Outstanding examples of this continuity of policy are the condemnation of certain Jansenistic propositions and the refusal to grant a Chinese liturgy even though the Jesuit missionaries had many more difficulties than our priests do today.

Eastern Liturgies

A very much stronger argument is the fact that many vernacular liturgies still exist in the Eastern churches, and that they have been accorded recognition by the Holy See. Both Pius IX in 1848 and Leo XIII in 1894 wrote of the antiquity of these liturgies. This leads us to the point that very few of them are in modern vernaculars, and these few are justified by quite extraordinary reasons.

The Greek, the Syriac, the Coptic or Egyptian, the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, the Armenian, Georgian are all far removed from the vernacular

of today. Arabic was imposed on the Syrians, Copts, Maronites, and Melkites of Syria and Palestine by their Muslim conquerors so that it took the place of the ancient Syriac of the Byzantine rite which the conquered peoples soon forgot. Staroslav or Old Slavonic is also far removed from everyday common speech. Hence arguments for an English vernacular based on the plea that vernaclular liturgies exist in the East are fallacious.

Again, the discipline of the East so differs from the West that one cannot ordinarily use the practice of the one as an argument for contemplated changes in the other. Furthermore, in the West the adoption of the vernacular for the liturgy has always been associated with movements away from the center of unity. This was true of the Albigenses and Hussites before the Reformation. It marked the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans at the Reformation and the Jansenists and Old Catholics since the Reformation. Between the two world wars a vernacular liturgy was one of the aims of the nationalist church in Czechoslovakia.

Some also urge the argument from the Holy See's action with regard to Roumania and Czechoslovakia as well as post-war concessions to Catholics of Germany and France. Is there a true parallel here?

An Exceptional Case

Modern Roumanian became a liturgical language only in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Latin, the original liturgical tongue, forcibly suppressed by the Bulgars in the ninth century was replaced by Old Slavonic, which was in turn replaced by Greek after the Turkish conquest. Some, however, remained faithful to the Paleoslav, but when teachers of the language could no longer be found, the people adopted their ordinary Roumanian of everyday life rather than accept the Greek of Constantinople. Thus, modern Roumanian gradually became the language of the liturgy. Then, when many Transylvanian Roumanians wished to be united with Rome, the Holy See gave its approval of Roumanian in the liturgy. Such an exceptional case hardly presents a parallel with our alleged case for an English vernacular.

More to the point are the concessions made to the Czechs in 1920. After the birth of the new Republic of Czechoslovakia, there arose almost immediately a movement in favor of an autonomous national Church. To avert the dangers involved, certain concessions in favor of the national tongue were granted by the Holy See to the Archibishop of Prague on June 13, 1920.

The concessions were of a limited nature. The greatest concessions named five feast days, for the celebration of Mass, not in modern Czech, but in Paleoslav. These Masses were to be celebrated only in eight sanctuaries famous in Czech history. Hence these limited concessions furnish no valid argument for a grant of a vernacular liturgy in this country. Finally the Holy See did not grant a vernacular liturgy as such, nor was it asked for by the Ordinaries.

Modern Concessions

We must also consider the privileges which would appear to have been readily granted to Germany and France. Conditions in France, though, are very different from our own. We, a small Catholic minority in loyal adherence to the Faith, contrast strongly with the Catholic France to a great extent gone pagan. Some French bishops consider that only extraordinary means will restore France to Christianity. In this country most people agree that such means are neither necessary nor helpful. What constitutes a valid argument for a change in

France may fail to apply in the differing circumstances and problems here in England.

With the grant of these privileges the French bishops sent warnings about unwarranted "development of the liturgical life in the country." The Archibishop of Bordeaux, Mgr. Feltin, in his article in *La Documentation Catholique* of November, 1946, indicated the advantages of retaining Latin, but also apparently hoped that certain concessions would be made in the teaching portion of the liturgy, and warned that it would be a mistake to imagine that "when this is permitted, our churches will then be filled with fervent worshippers." He termed the real cause of the people's inability to participate in liturgical worship "religious ignorance in general." Remedies lie in the instruction of the people on the meaning and value of the Mass and in giving them a minimum of biblical knowledge. The French Cardinals and Archibishops, however ready to try new ideas, were apparently just as ready to re-echo the warnings and advice of Trent.

English Devotion to Latin

This cursory examination seems to show that no arguments taken from conditions prevailing elsewhere can greatly strengthen the plea for a vernacular liturgy in England. Are conditions here such that they demand a change as the only solution to our difficulties? Surely it is erroneous to assume that such is the influence of the Book of Common Prayer upon English life that only an English Catholic liturgy can effectively counteract it.

History proves how deeply devoted the Anglo-Saxons and later Normans were to the Roman rite. Even the Reformation in this country was not a truly national movement but the work of a minority furthering their own political and financial ends. The rising of 1549 and later rebellions demanded the restoration of the Latin Mass. The English peasantry and yeomanry looked upon the new vernacular Communion service as a Twelfth Night mummery.

The English prayer book was enforced by rack and gibbet. It influenced our literature and speech, but does its influence go any deeper? The large number of nominal Anglicans is sufficient answer. It has little or no value today to stimulate religious revival.

In addition to this negative argument there is the positive one of the attitude of English Catholics themselves. The Church in England did live on in spite of persecution. Hunted and harried as they were, our relatively few Catholics of penal times were sustained, strengthened, and inspired by the Latin Mass and sacraments. Why, then, is it impossible for the present-day English Catholics to appreciate the same Latin liturgy?

Vernacular Inopportune

At a time when men are striving to break down the barriers that separate nations, this attempt to secure a vernacular liturgy seems strangely inopportune. The religious and devotional apathy of today springs from the materialism in which we live. A vernacular liturgy is no magic talisman to cure it. The spiritually dead need revitalizing. The action of the Mass and the efficacy of the sacraments can accomplish this rebirth without recourse to a new liturgical language. Would not the Mass said in its own tongue remain a symbol and a reminder of that unity which exists between the members of Christ?

Many practical difficulties would occur if vernacular liturgy were granted, ranging from the limitation of this service to England or to

English speaking peoples to the harassment of masters of ceremonies trying to arrange a service when many bishops and priests of different rites are to concelebrate.

Church discipline does change, and the change may come. But until that time can we be blamed for urging solid reasons for retaining this age-old liturgy, and for suggesting that possibly we have not tried everything short of a change of liturgical tongue to solve today's religious problems?

Father Howell Replies

Following the publication of Father Coyne's article, Father Clifford Howell, S.J., whose article favoring the vernacular appeared in the January issue of *Theology Digest,* answered some of the objections raised by Father Coyne. The present account is taken from *The Clergy Review* 37(1952), pp. 314-316:

Father Coyne's article is one of the ablest presentations of the anti-vernacular case I have ever read. It is free of the often refuted objections from universality, mysteriousness, and others. I shall be able to answer a few of his arguments only briefly.

That the use of the vernacular for the liturgy has been always associated with movements away from unity may be countered by pointing out that, though the great heresies were conceived while their originators used the Latin Liturgy, they were spread by means of the vernacular because of its singular merits for spreading the error. It shouldn't be less effective for spreading the truth.

That our English martyrs died for the Latin Mass has yet to be shown. It seems rather they died for the Mass itself, which by the course of circumstances was then celebrated in Latin.

That the Fathers of the Council of Trent rejected the claims for a vernacular liturgy is simply not the case according to recent scholarship. Rather, it might be said that the Fathers considered the times inopportune for such a change, because of the demands and claims of the heretics concerning the vernacular. But they were most careful to leave the way open for future changes, should these become desirable.

Lastly, it may be shown by several examples of recent history that the vernacular has gained great ground in the Church in recent centuries, e.g., in the Scriptures and Missals for the laity. And this has been with the approval of the Church, whose official attitude is one of gradual and controlled concession.

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT—A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(For a much more complete bibliography see *Revista Española de Teología,* 12(1952), pp. 153-173.

Barth, K., *Die Oekumenische Aufgabe in den reformierten Kirchen der Schweiz* (Zurich, 1949). Review: *Église Vivante,* 2(1950), 258.

Congar, Y., O.P., *Chrétiens désunis. Principes d'un "oecuménisme catholique* (Cerf: Paris, 1937). Reviews: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,* 26(1937), 793f.; *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* 14(1937), 684-686.

Florousky, G., "The Eastern Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Movement," *Ecumenical Review,* 1950, pp. 89-96 and 127-128.

Fruscione, S., S.J., "Ecumenismo e unità della Chiesa secondo i protestanti," *Civiltà Cattolica,* 101(1950:2), 511-522. Cfr. also by same author, 101(1950:2), 249-259; (1950:3), 137-149 and 501-515.

Guzzetti, G. B., "Il Movimento ecumenico fino ad Amsterdam," *La Scuola Cattolica,* 77(1949), 243-264.

Hoffmann, J. G. H., *Nathan Soederblom, prophete de l'Oecuménisme* (Geneva, 1948).

Keldany, H., "Gli anglicani e il Movimento ecumenico nel 1948," *La Scuola Cattolica,* 77(1949), 332-338.

Laros, W., *Schöpferischer Friede der Konfessionen die Una-Sancta-Bewegung, ihr Ziel und ihre Arbeit* (Reckinghausen, 1950). Review: *Église Vivante,* 3(1951), 360.

Rouse, R., *A History of the World's Student Christian Federation.* Review: *Irénikon,* 23(1950), 125f.

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE IDEAL OF RELIGIOUS OBEDIENCE

Related in theme to Father Camelot's article on obedience and liberty is an informative study by Josef Loosen, S.J., on the historical development and theological foundations of religious obedience. This study appeared in *Geist und Leben,* 24(1951), pp. 196-209.

Father Loosen shows how religious obedience passed through three stages which parallel the evolution of the religious life. Solitary anchorites were succeeded by cloistered monks living in organized communities, and these communities were succeeded by apostolic societies orientated toward the secular world as a field of action.

The early anchorites retired from the world to foster union with God in contemplation through prayer and asceticism. But specially-gifted individuals among them, like Saint Anthony, soon attracted disciples who came to them for spiritual guidance. Any obedience was dependent both in extent and duration upon the discretion of the disciple, and was given to a trusted and gifted director rather than to a juridically-constituted superior. It had a two-fold basis: the personal charismatic gifts of the master and the recognition that the self-renunciation of obedience was an effective means to the perfect fulfillment of God's will.

Pachomius, recognizing that many were not suited for the rigors of a solitary life, encouraged association for mutual assistance into communities organized according to a Rule. Obedience, as a means toward humility and as part of the imitation of Christ, was still directed primarily toward personal sanctification, but took on the added note of effecting incorporation into a common way of life. As exemplified by the Rule of Saint Benedict, this obedience was given to an Abbot juridically installed rather than to a personally-gifted master. The Rule and the monastic enclosure limited the scope of obedience; but within these limits, exact obedience was to be all-embracing.

Originally, the monasteries were closed communities; but a change took place as individual monks and houses applied themselves to works outside the monastery in order to meet the apostolic needs of the times. The definitive transformation to the modern apostolic orders, orientated toward the service of the Church and the salvation of souls, appears to have been begun by Saint Francis of Assisi and completed by Saint Ignatius. In these orders the earlier theological grounds of obedience were retained (self-renunciation, imitation of Christ, and identification of God's will with the superior's will), but the new apostolic orientation greatly modified the conception and practice of obedience. The individual, as before, must be ready to subordinate his own likes and preferences; he is not free to choose his activities and place of residence. Nevertheless, there is room for considerable initiative and freedom in the execution of assigned ministries, the reason being that consultation with superiors about details is often simply impossible. The inferior acts rather "according to the mind of the superior," the external direction of the superior being accompanied by the interior guidance of the Holy Spirit. Since in these apostolic societies the external bonds of union are often weakened, obedience given in a spirit of love and service provides the very important principle of unity.

The modern ideal, then, requires both that the apostolic worker should, as it were, obey from within by conforming his own mind and will to that of his superior, and that he should exercise a certain independence and initiative in carrying out the work assigned.

Congar, Y., O.P., "Position des orthodoxes et des anglicans en régard d'une position 'protestante' en Ecclésiologie," *Irénikon,* 23(1950), 298-308.

Daniélou, J., *Gespräche nach Amsterdam* (Zurich, 1949). Review: *Église Vivante,* 2(1950), 256.

Gill, G., S.J., "Problemi della riunione dei cristiani," *Civiltà Cattolica,* 102(1951:4), 74-80.

Gonsette, J., S.J., "La Conférence de Lambeth de 1948. Commentaire d'un catholique," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* 71(1949), 279-285.

The Lambeth Conferences (1867-1948). (London, 1948). Review: *Église Vivante,* 2(1950), 126.

Weigel, G., S.J., "Protestant Theological Positions Today," *Theological Studies,* 11(1950), 547-566.

RETRIBUTION or REHABILITATION:

SHOULD MAN CEASE JUDGING AND PUNISHING?

M. Thiéfry, S.J.

This article originally appeared in Nouvelle Revue Théologique, *73 (1951), pp 466-482, under the title "La justice doit-elle cesser de 'juger' et de punir?"*

In his 1942 Christmas address to the heads of states, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, spoke of the necessity of "a juridical order based on the supreme power of God, and capable of punishing as well as protecting . . ."

Civil authority's right and duty to punish, traditionally emphasized by Christian morality, was denied at the turn of the century by determinist criminologists. Seeing no evidence of freedom in criminal actions, they considered the criminal an irresponsible being whom heredity, environment, unmastered passion, and social constraint had forced into crime.

Though milder theories have since prevailed, such notions have not disappeared. Olof Kinberg, a Stockholm professor, terms free will a purely speculative idea with no empirical foundation. There are only transient, isolated acts of volition rising from the bio-psychological phenomena in the brain; these cannot be the source of responsibility, imputability, and the right to chastise. According to his positivistic theory, impulses are irresistible; there is no independent spiritual force in the brain which governs our reactions.

Such a thesis is unacceptable to Catholics. Yet we admit that, besides the classic causes of diminished responsibility, such factors as social maladjustment and immaturity merit consideration at the bar of justice.

Unfortunately some have identified the Christian notion of free will with Descartes' "faculty of free and independent choice." Christ was aware of the barriers to free choice when He said, "pray lest you succumb to temptation," and "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." St. Paul, St. Augustine, and others found their heredity, their environment, their bodies terrible fetters on the exercise of free will.

Nevertheless, no judge can conclude from this that all who are guilty of crime have suffered an eclipse of moral discernment. Every man is essentially free and responsible before God and his fellow man. And this moral responsibility, in so far as it parallels his juridical and legal responsibility, comprises the object of human justice.

Certainly social authority has not the right to punish the irresponsible. Penal law rightly exempts them from the repressive power of the state and prescribes social therapy best suited to their crimes and condition.

Can We Identify The Irresponsible?

But who are the irresponsible? Do our present classifications of criminals as normal, abnormal, and demented correspond to the facts of medicine and psychology? One eminent judge objects that criminal be-

havior will range from brute impulse to extreme cunning, that safe criteria of responsibility and irresponsibility are lacking; for a norm will fail to take account of those imponderables proper to each man. How, he asks, can the judge, himself a man, reconstruct the moment of crime and so weigh the criminal's freedom and responsibility?

On these grounds some would simply abstract from responsibility. Justice, incapable of evaluating imputability precisely, would become a technique of *social defense* through the scientific cure of the delinquent. Segregation of serious social risks would be kept but the judge would be at best a psycho-sociologist, not a judge of responsibility and punishment.

The Proper Role of the Judiciary

Before answering these objections let us recall the role of the judiciary authority under natural and Christian law. Civil authority must see to the observance of that part of the moral order which is concerned with man's relations with his fellow man. She does this through her judicial arm. Because formal sin as sin is beyond her sphere civil power is limited to protecting the public safety by maintaining the juridically established social-legal order, and to punishing infractions of that order by her repressive authority.

The Judge and Responsibility

Having defined and limited the degree of intervention in the moral order permitted to the judiciary, we can take up the objection that criteria of responsibility are relative and subjective, that "the bio-psychically normal man will vary with different times, surroundings, and observers . . ."

The objection has some force; but to conclude from this to an evolution of morality and law is to go beyond the premises. The facts presented merely indicate a simple evolution or modification of conscience. Morality remains objective, although different individuals in different times, places, and environments may understand and apply it differently.

Nor are all cases studied thus far in criminal psychiatry borderline cases. Experts do not hesitate to affirm in many instances either clear-cut absence of freedom or quite sufficient lucidity and freedom. What about responsibility *in causa*? Is he not responsible for his deeds who frequents the occasion of crime or neglects to curb his evil tendencies? Social therapy will never absolve such a man of responsibility in cause.

Weakness of will and vehemence of passion are not identical with abnormal psychopathy and loss of self-determination. Because of original sin weakness in the face of passion is implicated in the exercise of liberty. Christ once said, "Go and sin no more." It is evidently possible not to sin.

Medical science admits that it is not competent to pronounce on moral responsibility, and leaves it to the judge. "Fine," says the Judge, "but will that make our job any easier?"

God alone, it is true, can measure responsibility exactly. But does that forbid a man to judge other men when he has the authority? Since when are we excused from exercising authority on the pleas that we are fallible and the task difficult? By this logic the father of a family and his delegate, the teacher, would be forbidden to judge their children and pupils, to reward and punish them according to their merits. The inevitable margin of error in judgment arises from the imperfection of our nature and is the price of the benefits of life in society. It urges us to judge wisely, prudently, and impartially; it does not tempt us to abdicate our duty.

Two Solutions

As science advances, two solutions are presented: either medicine and psychology will come to the aid of criminology and facilitate the work of judging and punishing, or science will supplant justice, substituting for it psychic treatment, cures, and tonics with no reference to free will—all under the pretext of humaneness. Medicinal measures, no doubt, have their part to play in the moral and social recovery of the criminal. Christian moralists, in the spirit of Christ, will not the death of the sinner but that he be converted and live. At the same time, concern for the social recovery of the guilty should not blind us to the principal object of human justice—the preservation of the juridically established social order and public security. Rehabilitation is slow and uncertain; restoration of the social order can never suffer delay.

To abstract from responsibility, to make no appeal to conscience, to suppress the punitive function of authority is to render human justice unattainable. Civil order is a part of the moral order and therefore is based on the reason and free consent of man. In order to be effective it must have the right to impose laws on consciences and enforce them by restraint and penalty. To abstract systematically from responsibility for conduct, to refrain from punishing delinquents, to resort to a system of pure social defense is to try to achieve a human order by a means proper to controlling animals.

Impracticability

Moreover, this mechanical order will not work practically. If the stigma of ill-repute is removed, public honor and respect for virtue will disappear. Self-styled "born-criminals" and "criminals by impulse" will fill our institutions.

Education is not automatic, neither is re-education. Both need the cooperation of free will.

Should Irresponsibility Be Presumed?

But can we not at least abandon the presumption of responsibility in criminals? Can we presume them psychopaths until the public prosecutor proves their responsibility? The moralists answer with two conditions: If psychiatric observations can establsh that there are some factors which escape the understanding and confuse the will in the genesis of a criminal act, and if this confusion frequently, or I would say permanently, results in utter lack of self control, then the reverse of the presumption of responsibility could be accepted theoretically as a confirmed state of fact. But a caution! A "justice" which is medicinal in principle and only punitive by exception is likely to create an atmosphere of presumed *a priori* irresponsibility, an atmosphere as unhealthy as that of the pure social defense we spoke of above.

Penal Law and Vindictive Punishment

Many who still favor punitive justice would like to eliminate the aspect of vengeance and expiation, and stress the elements of reform and of preventive sanction. Punishment, they say, should relieve the guilty of any desire of repeating their deeds and serve as an efficacious example to anyone tempted to imitate them; but society has no right to exact expiation. "Vindictive punishment should be left to God alone . . ." writes Father J. Castelein, S. J. "Reparation of social disorder is ordained to prevention, not expiation . . ." And he is echoed by Father Cathrein, S. J., and by Canon Leclerq.

However, the constant scholastic tradition regards vindictive justice as a legitimate function of the civil judiciary. The question is indeed an

open one, but one whose solution, it seems to me, must not be guided by sentiment, nor by fear that the words *chastise, expiate, vindictive penalty* are inhuman and unchristian and should give way to *re-education, clinical treatment,* and *psychiatry.*

Practice of the Church

We may remark that our Holy Mother the Church imposes not only medicinal but also vindictive penalties; and according to Canon 2286, "The direct and proper end of vindictive penalties is the expiation of the delict; the remission of these penalties, therefore, does not depend on the amendment of the guilty party." While both medicinal and vindictive penalties consist in the privation of some spiritual or temporal good, the latter attach rather to the delict than to the delinquent. Though the delinquent's amendment be complete, the penalty may still have to be undergone!

In threatening these penalties the Church does not use her specifically divine power (the vicarious power of sacramental jurisdiction) but the human jurisdiction belonging to her as a perfect visible society; and she uses it within the limits of her proper object — the supernatural good of souls. If vindictive justice were inhuman and barbarous, how could the Church call it justice? Moreover, if it is valid in a religious society considered precisely as a human society, it is also valid for civil society, which has its social good to promote and its juridical order to maintain and to restore when disturbed.

God's exclusive rights will not be usurped if vindictive justice is limited to compensation for the social injury due to offenses which are voluntary and external. The moral disorders of conscience which have no direct and visible social effect are reserved to the divine judgment.

Should the civil tribunals, then, add vindictive penalties to the penalties of sanction and correction which they inflict? No; it will be enough if the vindictive character of these penalties is recognized. It is in the combination of rehabilitation, prevention, defense of society, education, and chastisement that we must look for the full justification of the right to punish.

Moral the True Measure

To humanize the representative function of justice, to work toward public security by reform of the criminal, is a sound Christian aim. But it is easy to overemphasize the opposition between the personal and social ends of justice. After all, is not the public order which justice and civil authority guarantee ordained to a personalist end—the individual citizen's opportunity for self-development? Let us not then sell morality too cheap, by replacing punishment with social therapy and reducing man to a bio-psychical machine. The moral measure is the true measure of man. If we would not be slaves of science we must make science work for us, helping us not only to know man, to cure him, to educate him, but also to defend him and judge him as a *man.* For man is not a plaything of his instincts; he is a son of God, a brother of Christ, and a temple of the Holy Spirit.

OTHER ARTICLES ON PENAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY

Joseph Collins, "The Grounds and Purposes of State Punishment," *Irish Theological Quarterly,* 19(1952), pp. 359-368. The power to punish, like all civil power, is for the common good, and its exercise is limited to the sphere of external acitvity. Punishment is *threatened* as a deterrant; it is *inflicted* primarily as juridical retri-

bution, that is, to repair injury done to the social order, viz., to public confidence in government. Emendation is secondary.

Henri Michard, "Où en est la criminologie?" *Études,* 273(1952), pp. 316-335. A review of the present status of criminology, which is still a miscellany of contributions by jurists, sociologists, etc., rather than a single discipline. Briefly indicates the few conclusive, but very impressive, findings of biology, sociology, and psychology; attempts a synthesis, and suggests practical conclusions.

Henry T. F. Rhodes, "The Christian Criminologists," *Dublin Review,* 226(1952), pp. 46-54. Reviews the early development of criminological theory and the emergence of a Christian school insisting on the freedom of man.

THE MORALITY OF MODERN WARS

Jesús M. Granero, S.J., "Sobre la moralidad de las guerras modernas," *Razón y Fe,* 145 (1952), pp. 341-360.

This article consists in a reexamination of the traditional doctrine of the Church on the morality of war, as expressed in the writings of the Popes, Suarez, Thomas, Vittoria, and De Lugo.

WORLD FEDERATION OF NATIONS: Present circumstances postulate a world federation or "Super-State" with unique authority in certain grave questions that affect the whole world. It is to be borne in mind that the world has so shrunk that all wars today have universal effects. Because the problem is of universal interest, each nation must accept its part in world unity. An egocentric mentality has been responsible for conflicts in the past and can lead to new wars that will be fatal for civilization.

There must be a modification of the moral and juridical doctrine that concedes the ultimate decision to the supreme sovereignty of each nation. The right of such curtailment is derived from the natural law without which the well-being of the world cannot be preserved. Even though the universe is divided into different nations, it has without a doubt a certain specific, quasi-political and moral unity to which the natural precept of charity and mercy refers.

In such a federation, if there is a war for the common utility, each nation would be obliged to participate without attending to its own proper advantages. This is the moral basis for the actual preparation against the feared aggression of Soviet Russia.

[1] The author's opinion is that no material interests today justify war, neither the desire for raw materials, nor colonies, nor commerce, nor the payment of reparations or debts. Human dignity and the sanctity of conscience are above material interests. To preserve these, war is not only licit but may be a duty and members of the world organization cannot be passive neutralists.

PREVENTATIVE WAR: This presents a grave problem. Modern wars by powerful aggressors are not improvised; rather, a giant preparation of means and material precedes the attack. We are speaking here not of mere conjecture of attack, but of certainty of intention of the other party. Such a preparation disturbs the whole economy and organization of life and injects in the veins of the future victim the poison of insecurity and fear. Such a preparation is already a kind of attack even before the firing of the first cannon. This "Cold War" has catastrophic consequences on the whole world. Moral judgment would indicate that a state that mobilizes its forces, industry, economy, and whole society to attack, in the present circumstances of the world, is already attacking in reality. If all legitimate means have been used to bring a cessation of these motives of alarms and fears without success, then war against such preparation would be in reality a war of defense.

MODERN WEAPONS: The natural law would impose a revision of modern weapons; for they go beyond what can be in consonance with moral laws. The use of Atomic, Toxic and Bacteriological weapons against non-military objects cannot be morally justified. Neither can they be used against an enemy, except in defense against an enemy that has used them first.

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

An immense amount of literature has been written on the Dead Sea Scrolls since their discovery a short time ago. The present summary merely attempts to indicate the main points connected with their discovery. A suitable bibliography on the subject can be found by consulting the *Catholic Biblical Quartely* from 1949 to the present.

The Discovery Itself

Early in the spring of 1947, some Bedouins found a number of MSS in a cave near the Dead Sea. In February, 1949, scientific excavation of the cave yielded some MSS fragments and fragments of jars in which the MSS were stored. It is considered to be the most important discovery of MSS in modern times. The biblical texts are the oldest discovered so far.

The Contents of the MSS

1) The Isaias scroll containing the complete text of the biblical book with a few lacunae; 2) the Manual of Discipline or Sectarian Document comprising the rules of an unknown Jewish sect; 3) a commentary on Habacuc; 4) what appears to be the long-lost apocryphal book of Lamech in Aramaic; 5) four scrolls containing hymns of thanksgiving; 6) a MS describing a war entitled "The Battle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness"; 7) a fragmentary scroll with sections from Isaias; 8) fragments of Daniel, Leviticus; fragments of a non-biblical scroll of a poetic character; many unidentifiable fragments.

Methods of Determining the Dates of the MSS

1. *Paleographic*: considers the way the written characters are formed, and attempts to date MSS by fitting them into their place in the gradual development of the letter-forms. This method is trustworthy but is not yet fully developed.

2. *Archeological*: considers evidence extrinsic to the MSS, and attempts to date them by association with the ancient remains discovered in the same cave. This method indirectly helps to date the MSS by determining when they were placed in the cave.

3. *Philologic-linguistic*: attempts to date the MSS by comparing the language used with the language of other documents whose dates are already known.

4. *Radioactive carbon*: a method by which the age of a thing that was once living can be determined by scientific analysis of the ratio of the normal isotope of carbon (C_{12}) to the heavy radioactive isotope (C_{14}). This method is unsatisfactory in this case, because part of MSS would have to be burned to perform the analysis; furthermore, the method itself is not completely perfected.

Problems Under Discussion

1. The date of composition of the MSS. At first, opinions ranged from the second century B.C. to the eleventh century A.D. Now, the weight of opinion places them before 25 A.D. The Isaias scroll goes back probably to the second century B.C.

2. The date of their being placed in the cave. Probably during the last half of the first century A.D., because the jars in which they were placed are definitely known to be no later than that.

3. The identification of the sect whose Manual of Discipline was found. There is no agreement among scholars on this point. Among the sects suggested are the Ebionites, the Pharisees, and the Essenes.

4. The identification of the persons in the commentary on Habacuc. There is no agreement as to the "Teacher of Righteousness," or the "Wicked Priest," who have the chief roles in this narrative.

5. The interpretation of "The Battle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness." Nothing definite on this yet.

6. The relation of the scrolls with the New Testament. Some expressions in the scrolls are identical with expressions in the New Testament, which a few scholars attempt to use to confirm their skeptical views of the New Testament. But the similarities are mostly those that they have in common with the Old Testament literature, which supplied some of the vocabulary of the New. However, this point is not yet sufficiently investigated.

After the first flood of interpretation, much of which was precipitate and had to be retracted, the atmosphere is gradually clearing. Little can be said with certainty as yet, except this fact, that the MSS were placed in the cave before the end of the first century A.D.

Bibliography: For those who wish further information on the subject of the Dead Sea Scrolls the following articles will be helpful.

Bea, A., S.J., "Nuova luce sui manoscritti ebraici recentemente scoperti," *Civiltà Cattolica,* 4(1952), pp. 257-276.

Graystone, G., S.M., "The Dead Sea Scrolls," *Scripture,* 5(1953), pp. 112-122.

Rowley, H.H., "The Internal Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* 2(1952), pp. 257-276.

Vincent, A., "Où en est la question des Manuscripts de la Mer Morte? Nouvelle Decouvertes," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* 26(1952), pp. 258-264.

MISSIOLOGY and The CATHOLICITY of The Church

Jean Bruls, S.A.M.

As Fr. Bruls points out in this article, the last quarter-century of mission history ranks high in the Church's missionary work both because of the enlightened leadership of the recent pontiffs and, especially, because of the promise this guidance gives for all future work among non-Christians. The article here digested originally appeared in Église Vivante, *3(1951), 267-293, 387-410, under the title of "Un tournant de la Catholicitè d'apres les paroles et les actes du Saint Siège."*

During the twenty centuries of its existence the Church has made several decisions of great importance to its universality. The first was to admit the gentiles on an equal footing with the Jews. The second was to go to the conquerors of the Roman Empire. This, too, is a decisive period in that the Church is dissociating herself from the idea that she is chiefly a Western group, a development which has been growing since the geographical discoveries in the sixteenth and following centuries revived interest in the missions.

This renewed effort at universality in outlook is being led by the Roman Pontiffs and certain far-sighted men, and its opportuneness is no longer matter for debate. Rome has acted vigorously.

I. The Native Clergy

The first concern of this movement has been to call to mind the reasons for a native clergy, to underline its importance, and to look after its adequate formation, so that it can occupy its proper place in the Church.

The Popes insist that the fundamental reason for a native clergy is the catholicity of the Church. The purpose of a mission is to establish the Church among a people. This will not be done until the people feel at home in the Church, until they are guided by their own clergy. To establish such a clergy is the traditional effort of the Church.

The second reason is methodological: native priests will be better able than strangers to present effectively the Christian doctrine to their compatriots.

Thirdly, there is a reason of the tactical order. The time may come when for one reason or another foreign missionaries are no longer welcome or are positively driven from a country. What will happen to the Church in such a country if there is no responsible native clergy?

Fourthly, the missionary cannot afford to set limits to his field of vision or actual apostolate. He must finish his work as soon as possible and go to others who need him. His is a preparatory role only.

Importance

In his encyclical *Maximum illud* (1919), Benedict XV complained that so many highly civilized peoples had not yet produced bishops to govern nor priests to teach. At the same time he directed that regional seminaries, the only practical solution under the circumstances, be erected in all mission territories if at all possible. His successors have followed him in this plea. Through the years, therefore, there has been

a steady growth in the number of the native clergy, from 4,516 in 1923 to 11,139 in 1949. Naturally the majority of these native priests are found in Asia (6,751 of the 11,139 in 1949) and the smallest percentage of them in Africa. There is a constant and regular growth in their numbers and the rate tends to increase each year.

Formation

The popes have repeatedly insisted upon a properly thorough formation of the native clergy in the regional seminaries. The Church cannot be content with an abridged or rudimentary formation of the native clergy. To see to this careful formation Pius XI (1934) gave Propaganda direct authority over these regional seminaries. Today their standards compare very favorably with those found in any seminary throughout the world.

Among the other means used to develop a native clergy might be mentioned *The Society of St. Peter the Apostle* founded by two French women in 1903 to help, spiritually and financially, the seminaries in mission countries. This Society is still doing much good work. Special note should also be taken of the *Collegium Urbanum de Propaganda Fide.* In 1925 it had ninety-five students; today it has almost 400 drawn from all parts of the mission world. Working with the *Urbanum* are the *Scientific Missionary Institute* and the *College of St. Peter* (both in Rome) where the native clergy can come for higher studies in theology.

These works and pleas of the Holy See have definitely assured the native clergy that theirs will be a truly proper formation.

Place in the Church

Sad to say the Holy See actually had to insist repeatedly that the native clergy is not to be looked upon as a "subordinate" group, as priests of second rank. Since they share in exactly the same priesthood and apostolate as that of the foreign missionaries, they are to be given full responsibility whenever possible. Until they can, little by little, replace the non-native priests, the two groups ought to be united in Christian charity and to work together for the good of the Church and the spread of the Kingdom of Christ.

II. The Native Episcopate

The turning-point in the establishment of the native hierarchy came in 1926 when Pius XI consecrated the first six Chinese bishops.

Although the first native priest to be consecrated bishop was Gregory Lo Wan-Tsao, who was made bishop of Canton in 1685; the movement, unfortunately, died with him.

The first native bishop in the twentieth century was Francis T. Roche, named bishop of Tuticorin in 1923.

The present movement got its real start in China when his Eminence Celse Cardinal Costantini was appointed Apostolic Delegate to China in 1922. One of his first acts was to name Fathers Odoric Ch'eng and Melchior Souen Prefects Apostolic of Puchi and Lihsien.

The Great Year: 1926

The year of realization for the Church in China came in 1926 when Pius XI called six native Chinese priests to Rome there to be consecrated bishops by his Holiness himself on October 28. "I asked you," Pius told the Bishops-elect, "to come here to show to the entire world the unity, the catholicity, and the apostolicity of the Church."

That day was a truly historic one, not only for China but also for the whole Church; for this was to be no isolated act. Other episcopal consecrations would follow rapidly, both in China and elesewhere in mission territories. Pius himself ex-

pressed this hope in a consistorial allocution on December 20, 1925.

Development

Soon India would have five native bishops. Japan's first came in the person of his Excellency Janvier Hayasaka, consecrated Bishop of Nagasaki in 1927. So the progress continued until in 1930 a Catholic Ethiopian priest was named Ordinary of the Catholics of the Ethiopian rite. He was the first native African bishop of modern times.

Still no really important center of population was under the control of the native bishops. Would the native bishops, then, tend to become "auxiliary" to the non-native bishops? This fear was allayed with the naming of His Excellency Paul Yu Pin to the See of Nanking in 1936 and of His Excellency Peter Doi to Tokyo in 1937.

At the death of Pius XI (1939) forty-eight mission territories had been confided to native bishops.

Pius XII left no doubt but that he would continue the work of his predecessor. In his first encylical, *Summi Pontificatus,* he announced that he himself would, on the following feast of Christ the King, consecrate twelve new bishops for the missionary territories, five of whom would be native. At last all continents and human races would be represented in the Catholic episcopate.

In Japan the normal evolution was hurried when a civil law was enacted which accorded juridic personality to religious associations if their directors were Japanese. To satisfy this condition the direction of thirteen territories passed into the hands of the native Japanese clergy in 1940 and 1941. The Church was officially recognized by the government as a juridical person in May of the same year. Most of the non-native missionaries stayed on to help their successors.

This formula of collaboration between native and foreign-born missionaries is the one recommended by Pius XII in his *Evangelii Praecones* (1951). Because a diocese is given into the care of a native bishop does not, usually, mean that it is sufficient to itself in all things. For a long time it will need outside help which is discreet and willing to remain in a subordinate position.

Completion

Thus during the last quarter-century truly remarkable progress has been made in freeing the Church from the danger of occidentalism.

Upon the elevation of a Chinese prelate, his Eminence Thomas Tien, to the Cardinalate in 1946, Pius XII could truly speak of the supranationality of the Church as an accomplished fact. Now the Church of the missions would take its part in the government of the universal Church.

Furthermore, to emphasize the definite establishment of the Church in China Pius XII, in April 1946, established an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in that country with twenty residental Archbishops and seventy-nine residental bishops.

III. Political Relations

The establishment of a native clergy and hierarchy is not enough. The Church in the mission territories must also be liberated from certain political influences which cause grave damage and disfigure her universal character. The liberation from these is the second characteristic of the modern mission reform.

The Protectorates

During the last four centuries certain European governments, especially Portugal and France, had taken under their protection the Catholic missionaries in many re-

gions, and so had become intermediaries between Catholic missionaries and the Holy See, or between the missions and the local governments.

No one will deny that at times this right of patronage had helped the Church, but it is also true that it is, today, incompatible with strong, legitimate national susceptibilities and with the development of a "native" Church. Furthermore, this right has given the Church a very foreign look and has been a veritable hotbed of political abuses.

The Holy See has repeatedly said that it will not accept nor recognize such patronage of foreign governments. In 1950, Portugal gave up most of her rights in a new agreement with the Holy See.

Diplomatic Relations

With the compromising intermediaries out of the way, Rome proceeded to increase the number of its direct representatives, Apostolic Delegates and Internuncios, to the mission countries.

The Apostolic Delegates are sent to countries which do not have official relations with the Vatican; in practice they are the Vatican's representatives to those governments.

The final, normal form of diplomatic relations between an independent country and the Holy See is through an Internunciature. Three of these (for China, India, and Indonesia) have been set up since the second World War. More are being planned.

It would do little good to eliminate political interferences by diplomatic action if those interferences were kept alive in the hearts of the missionaries themselves. He who is sent on a mission must be nothing else but an envoy of the universal Church.

Every document of the Holy See pertaining to the missions, from *Maximum Illud* (1919) to *Evangelii Praecones* (1951), has emphasized this point: No missionary worthy of the name has the right to promote the material advantages or the culture of the country of his origin. Once he is sent to the mission he must consider the country to which he is sent as his own, and he must serve it with all his powers—it is his second native country.

IV. The Christian People

But the Church is not only the clergy and the bishops; the Catholic laity also has its own responsibility and an active role to play.

The necessity of Catholic action, on the spiritual and the non-spiritual level, is particularly evident in mission countries. It is the particular duty of the Catholic laity to see to it that Christian principles penetrate the life of the nation; that religion inspire them with a zeal to help their fellow-citizens and to work for the good of their homeland as much as possible. Moreover, by being first-rate citizens they will effectively refute the accusation that theirs is "a foreign religion."

The laity cannot perform its proper role until the Church is rooted in the life and thought of the nation. Once it is so rooted the active and responsible role of the laity logically follows.

V. The National Cultures

Must the convert in a mission country cut himself off, culturally, from his fellow-citizens because their customs, ways of thinking and of acting are the products of paganism? If he does, does he not become a traitor in their eyes and thereby hinder the spread of the Church? How is he to solve these problems?

The problem was "solved" for the Chinese by the Constitution of Benedict XIV (1742) which brought the famous rites controversy to an end. Thus Christians were

forbidden all participation in the ceremonies in honor of Confucius, and the missionaries were charged not to raise the question again.

As time went on the purely civil character of these ceremonies became more evident; the question, though, became one of great urgency when the Japanese government in Manchukuo made the official honoring of Confucious obligatory. When the problem was presented to Propaganda a thorough study of the case was made.

Relying on the government declaration affirming that these ceremonies have no religious character, Propaganda judged that they could be tolerated, except those elements which could easily be misinterpreted or give scandal. At the same time the Chinese bishops once more permitted the bowing of the head to the deceased as being only civil homage rendered to the dead as is the custom in the East. These decrees were approved by the Holy Father himself.

A similar problem, although more delicate because the ceremonial involved rites taken from pagan religions, presented itself in Japan. In solving this problem Propaganda recalled a principle stated many years before the condemnation of the Chinese rites. "The Faith does not reject nor does it do harm to the rites and customs of any nation, provided that they are not immoral; on the contrary, it wishes to protect them."

Applying this principle to the present case and being assured that the ceremonies in question are looked on as merely civil, Propaganda permitted Japanese Catholics to take part in these observances provided they are ready, if necessary, to make known their good intention.

These two decisions, though quite different from those in effect during the last two centuries, represent the true tradition of the missionary Church. A sad situation has been abolished, and it is once again possible for an Oriental to be a good Catholic while remaining faithful to his national traditions.

Applications of these principles have since been made in India and Africa. It pertains to the Bishop to judge in particular cases, in a spirit well defined by the Roman directives.

Religious Art

It is a simple fact that "from the moment that the Missions were organized . . . with a foreign hierarchy, with the aid of foreign governments, with a dominant foreign spirit, it was inevitable that the missionary art should also be foreign."

Here we have the evil and its causes. For many missionaries there was only one Christian art—that which they had known in the land of their birth.

Attention was drawn to this lack of naturalization in the realm of art by a letter of Propaganda in 1922. In 1924 the First Plenary Council of China commanded that whenever possible Chinese art should be used in the construction and ornamentation of sacred edifices and parochial residences. It also believed that "as an ordinary thing songs in the language of the foreign missionary should be excluded in the mission churches."

Pius XI wished to encourage the efforts of native Christian art and make known its first results by an Exposition of Sacred Art of Mission Countries in Rome in 1940. Because of the war the plan for this exposition was not realized until 1950, during the Holy Year.

The Civilizations

In all the decisions we have been considering we are happy to see

reappear in the missiology of the Church a profound respect for all authentic human values, an attitude of understanding toward differing civilizations. Pius XII has continued the good work promoted so successfully by his predecessor.

Not so long ago the average missionary, in good faith, identified Christian civilization and European civilization without ever dreaming that one can be civilized without being a Christian, or civilized and Christian without being European. Such an attitude necessarily disgusts and alienates the majority of non-Christians, particularly the cultured classes.

The Oriental convert must *not* abandon his civilization, rather he must remain faithful to it so as to vivify it from the interior with the spirit of Christ. On his part the missionary must, as far as possible, prefigure him who will be the native Christian, once the national culture is baptized.

If we think of these civilizations as bad in themselves and incompatible with the Gospel, the whole adaptation will be one of hypocrisy and will not last. If we think, with Pius XII, that "the Christian life can co-exist" with them, our adaptation will be lasting and of real value. Pagan culture and wisdom is the reflection of the sun; it has prepared the peoples to see the sun itself, the Church.

Universal in right and in hope according to her origin, the Church henceforth expresses in deeds this universality, which wins for her the name of catholic. She is open to all, and each one can, when entering here, keep what is his own, sin excepted. As in Europe the Church made herself European, she is able to and must make herself Chinese in China, Indian in India. . . .

Nevertheless, there is still much to do; before the harmony between Christianity and the pre-Christian cultures has produced in Asia and in Africa the results which it has produced in the Occident, much time and effort must be expended.

We wish in this paper to point out one fact: thanks to the Roman directives, the structure of the Church is now coterminal with the structure of humanity. In the bosom of the People of God, all human particularities have found their place; the proper genius that God has imparted to each branch of the human family finds all its value in the unity of the same faith where, while meditating on and living the Gospel, each brings to the others that which he has found to be better.

WHY IS EXISTENTIALISM ATHEISTIC?

Benoît Pruche, O.P., "Pourquoi l'existentialisme est-il athee?" *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* 21(1951), pp. 287-307.

The point of departure of extreme existentialism, as exemplified in the writing of M. Jean-Paul Sartre, is human consciousness. On analysis of this subjective data, a man is brought face to face with the problem of the one and the many on the level of both existence and essence. Sartre does not solve the problem; he refuses to face it. On a priori grounds he denies the unity and fullness of existence, for existence is viewed as a mere phenomenon of being beyond which you need not go. Further, the very notion of contingence is absurd and unintelligible. Sartre also denies the unity of essence, for there is no such thing as a fixed nature of man. Hence the meaning of existentialism's first principle: "Among man, and man alone existence is prior to essence."

Human reality, therefore, has no meaning or right other than that which it gives to itself by free self-projection. The freedom of Sartre's man is that of a being in a realm of pure possibles, with no connection with any one of them. Each man, who is his own law, must by his own free acts create for himself his proper essence. From this it is clear that man has no need of God; in fact, God becomes an impossibility.

Obedience and Liberty

Th. Camelot, O.P.

Obedience, and particularly religious obedience, appears to conflict with the liberty so dear to modern man and with the liberty proclaimed in the Gospel. In the following article which appeared in La Vie Spirituelle, *86(1952), pp. 154-168, Father Th. Camelot, O.P., shows how obedience based on faith helps to restore the self-possession lost through original sin and to develop the fullness of human personality.*

More even than pleasure, modern man craves liberty and independence. This jealously-guarded personal independence may itself hide an unsuspected servitude, but the fact remains that people are unwilling to obey any master.

The Christian too treasures liberty as one of his most precious acquisitions. He has been freed by Christ and is determined not to relapse into the ancient slavery. The truth has made him free; and the more completely he understands the truth of God revealed in the Gospel, the more he realizes his liberty and resists all enslavement.

This being true, is not obedience a surrender of liberty, a real mutilation? And does not obedience, in practice, actually produce inert and spineless characters, dull or inhibited personalities, painfully bruised and doomed to life-long immaturity?

The Christian Is Obedient

And yet, this obedience is beyond question a Christian virtue, ranking among the very highest. By definition, the Christian life is the imitation and reproduction of the life of Christ; but Christ was extraordinarily obedient. In the religious life, is not obedience the fundamental principle? This elementary truth, taught by St. Benedict and by St. Thomas, was reaffirmed by our Holy Father in his discourse to the Congress on the States of Perfection (Dec. 8, 1950).

To harmonize the constant insistence on obedience with the irrepressible aspirations of liberty poses a painful dilemma that can seriously endanger the vocation and even the faith of religious. It is our hope to draw from the Gospels principles which may bring peace and freedom to such souls and show them that religious obedience is a school of peace and interior liberty.

The Christian is Free

"Take note of your dignity, Christian," says St. Leo. We might also say, "Take note of your liberty," the liberty perfected for the Christian on Easter and on the morning of his baptism. Doubtless the revival of Easter liturgy will make Christians more vividly aware that the Savior's death and resurrection broke the bonds of an oppressive servitude and that baptism made us adopted sons, and *free*.

For His followers as for Himself, Jesus claimed a sovereign liberty from the prescriptions of the Law and the burdensome accretions of tradition. This precipitated the frequent clashes between Jesus and the Pharisees and drew from Him that decree of liberation: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mc. 2:27). Even more perhaps than Christ, St. Paul insists upon the freedom and newness of spirit won for the Christian by Christ, and condemns all at-

tempts to reimpose the yoke of the Law. ". . . where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." (2 Cor. 3:17).

It should be clearly understood that the liberation here referred to is from slavery to *sin,* for in some mysterious way the Law, good and holy in itself, was the instrument of sin (Cf. Rom. 7:7-13; 4:15). At the very beginning of human history, Adam wanted to unburden himself of God's law. Instead of submitting to his Father, in the trusting obedience of a child, he wanted to set up his own law, to be autonomous, and experience for himself good and evil. The result was a crushing slavery to illusion and error, to pride, to the "world," and to tyrannizing passions. That is the only true slavery, and from that Christ has delivered us. The Christian regains his true liberty by making himself a servant of "justice" and holiness, by offering himself to God. In this voluntary service, he recovers a princely liberty, liberty from error and illusion, from sin and impurity, from the powers of the "world." Nothing frightens him and he experiences already the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. 8:21).

Religious Obedience

Though this Christian liberty is given at baptism, it is still far from complete. At the beginning, the law of sin lives on in the body, and a man does not do that which he wills. But here Christian and religious obedience enters in to further develop and train interior liberty.

When the Israelites had been freed from the slavery of Pharaoh, they were still children and incapable of directing themselves; accordingly God in the desert gave them a law, with countless detailed prescriptions, designed to lead them to Christ (Gal. 3: 24). Similarly, the Christian needs a *pedagogue* to complete his delivery from the law of sin. Thus religious poverty develops liberality and trains us to use creatures with a free detachment; chastity trains our affections and frees the heart for a higher love; and obedience develops our liberty.

Since God has left man in the hands of his own counsel (Eccles. 15: 14) a person must act as a free and reasonable being. Even the vow of obedience does not suppress free deliberation; it merely keeps a religious from following his whims, self-love, and pride; and teaches him to do in all things only the will of God.

The religious, therefore, learns through obedience to devote himself wholly to God. He is open to the interior action of the Holy Spirit and is disposed to respond with a joyful spontaneity. Through obedience he starts on the road to perfection, and having reached perfection, he obeys with even greater alacrity in order to protect what he gained. In that state he has totally identified his will with the will of God manifested to him in the superior's will. Having been led by obedience to the perfection of charity, which consists in identity of will, in willing and not willing the same, he obeys effortlessly, with perfect ease and supreme liberty. Hence the Little Flower's happy exclamation: "I always do my own will."

Monastic Obedience

The almost infinite variety of forms in which the ideal of evangelical perfection has been realized in the course of history can, it seems, be grouped into two types of religious life, monastic and apostollic, each of which possesses a distinct form of obedience.

The first type, which is sketched in the old monastic rules and which still flourishes vigorously, in differ-

ent abbeys and monasteries, is familial and paternal in spirit. The abbott is really the father, who distributes to his children the food, work, and spiritual nourishment suited to them. If obedience is necessary for securing the good order of a home, it is still more so for training those learning to wage war on the devil and to employ the tools of the spiritual life. Thus it is that the monk ought always to be guided by the abbot in the way of perfection like a pupil by his master or a child by his father, doing nothing without his permission.

Nevertheless, the filial submission of the monk or the nun to the abbot or abbess must not degenerate into infantilism or childishness, for obedience ought not to suppress interior liberty, nor do away with prudence, fortitude, and magnanimity. Opportunities to exercise these virtues will be found in those employments and offices of the monastery which require initiative and skill, and especially in each one's participation in the management of the family. The Rule of St. Benedict, for instance, lays considerable stress on the "Council of the Brethren," where the whole community assembles, and where even the youngest can be called on for his opinion. It is only for ordinary matters of lesser importance that the abbot will content himself with the advice of the senior monks. The same lesson is brought out by the teaching of St. Thomas and the example of St. Theresa of the Child Jesus.

Apostolic Obedience

A second form of obedience is found in the "apostolic" orders and congregations which made their first appearance in the thirteenth century. These communities of clerics and "adults" are governed by superiors elected for a limited term of office, and are orientated toward very definite and at times very diversified labors, they demand in their members initiative and responsibility, full freedom of movement in certain circumstances, and supernatural prudence enlightened by a pure faith and animated by an ardent charity. Doubtless obedience will organize community life and the activities of the apostolate, but at the same time it will train the soul to a profound submission to and dependence upon God. Such obedience will at times demand painful sacrifices, but will still leave the religious interior liberty, peace, and joy. Though obedience in the apostolic life allows considerable latitude in small daily details and in the execution of assignments, it nevertheless lies at the heart of all activity. The tasks and duties delegated by the superior completely occupy the religious every minute of the day. Thus, by obedience, the entire life of the apostle is a sacrifice of homage to God.

Superiors and Inferiors

This brief presentation of the Scriptural and theological foundations of obedience throws light on the mutual relations between superiors and inferiors. Obedience being a total submission to God in ever-growing interior liberty, it is obvious that the authority of the superior is not meant to satisfy an unconscious hunger for domination, and should not aim at suppressing natural talents and aspirations. It is worth recalling too that religious laws and customs are not ends in themselves, but have been introduced both to secure the common good, and to lead souls to the perfection of charity, according to the spirit of the Gospel, which is liberty. Obedience imposes restraints only to promote interior liberty and to free the religious from all traces of spiritual immaturity. Domineering and oppressive authority

and excessive burdens which overwhelm the subject and paralyze his human and spiritual development overstep the just limits of obedience. For the religious who has renounced all to seek God has the *right* to find his spiritual development in the very renunciations of obedience.

The religious subject, on his part, will look on obedience as a means of formation and liberation. The formation we are here concerned with does not refer solely to the training of the novice in the usages of the religious life which develop the bearing proper to a religious. Rather, obedience must train the religious not to act on impulse or caprice, or even from motives which are reasonable perhaps and virtuous, but purely personal. Rightly understood, obedience will teach him to direct his actions according to the demands of charity and the common good, and will develop a sense of responsibility by opening his judgment to horizons reaching beyond self. When confronted by a new unforeseen situation, he will do without any command just what would be expected of him. It follows, then, that any obedience which would allow the subject to remain forever immature would be missing its objective. It is by obeying that the child of God becomes an adult.

Liberty and the Cross

However, in insisting on the rights and demands of our liberty, let us be on our guard that what we call liberty is not really servitude, a cloak of our malice and a pretext for self-gratification (Cf. 1 Peter. 2:16; Gal. 5:13). On the contrary, this liberation from ourselves, from our pride and false liberty, will at times be painful, for we can recover the royal liberty of the sons of God only by traveling the road laid out for us by the only-begotten Son of God, who was obedient even to the death of the cross. It would be naïve to think that obedience will always be an easy and pleasant road. In following the steps of Christ, it will be necessary to discard many of our illusions, our pride, and independence. But this path will lead us to peace and joy in the original unity lost by Adam. Like charity, obedience contributes to unity, and thereby to liberty.

To come to particulars, obedience keeps the religious in readiness for any kind of assignment. From one day to the next he may be taken from an agreeable and fruitful ministry and sent elsewhere, far away perhaps, to a land that is strange and unproductive. A painful experience certainly, but still a liberation. The man who obeys is not tied down to any particular creature. He is ready for any assignment; nothing holds him back. His liberty remains complete, determined only by the will of God which is infinite in its compass.

A final observation. Obedience will be truly free and mature only if it is fundamentally freed from all human motivation and attachments. In other words, one must obey for God and for God alone. To obey a superior solely because he or she is sympathetic and understanding is to obey a human being, not as the representative of God, but precisely for his or her human qualities. To obey for such reasons is not to obey God in the glorious liberty of God's children, but rather it is to make oneself a slave to a man. Christian and religious obedience is built on faith. Only thus will it be free and productive of freedom. St. Augustine gives this counsel: We must obey not as slaves under the Law, but as children, *free* persons, under the rule of grace; and grace is liberty.

LITURGICAL CONFERENCES:

A Report

The liturgical reform was a work encouraged and directed by Blessed Pius X. Since his pontificate, scholars have devoted themselves to a study of the history of the liturgy with a view to the reform of Breviary and Missal and to more active participation by the laity in the worship of the Church. Two results of this effort have been the publication of the new version of the Psalter (1945) and the new rite for Holy Saturday (1951). The following articles report the results of the latest liturgical conferences. Father Hecht's article appeared in Ephemerides Liturgicae, *66(1952), pp. 134-139. The second digest is drawn from several sources: Father Illtud Evans, O.P., published his account in* Blackfriars, *33(1952), pp. 513-517, and in* Worship, *27(1953), pp. 149-153. Dom Bernard Capelle, O.S.B., published his account in* Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales, *33(1952), pp. 248-252.*

Maria-Laach, 1951

In 1948 the Liturgical Institute of Trier together with the Centre de Pastorale Liturgique of Paris drew up plans for an international congress to discuss the reform of the Roman Missal. This congress was finally held July 12-15, 1951, at the Benedictine Abbey of Maria-Laach. Forty-eight representatives were present from several different countries, French and German being the official languages. Bishop Stohr of Mayence represented the Fulda Liturgical Conference for the German hierarchy, the Most Rev. Abbot of Maria-Laach was the presiding dignitary. Dr. Wagner of the Trier Institute acted as chairman.

In his opening address Dr. Wagner pointed out the purpose of the meeting, which was to discuss the proposed reforms and to shed new light on them, without however taking any official action, leaving this to those to whom it belonged.

In order to submit to the Holy See the experience acquired in the first celebration of the Easter Vigil, the first part of the conference was devoted to this new rite. After thorough discussion and evaluation, emendations were proposed based upon the experience of the previous year. Many of these suggestions were adopted by the Holy See in the 1952 revision of the rite. This new rite was also used as the norm in many of the proposed reforms of the Roman Missal.

The second part of the conference, more important because of its implications, concerned the reform of the Roman Missal. This came up for point by point discussion.

Father Jungmann, S.J., of Innsbruck spoke of the *Ordo Missae.* Using his own celebrated discussion of this question *(Missarum Solemnia),* he pointed out how the celebration of Mass might be accommodated to modern needs and to the findings of liturgical science.

Fr. Botte, O.S.B., of Louvain treated the evolution of the Canon

of the Mass. Except for a few small changes, we are indebted to Gregory the Great for the Canon, and little emendation would be required to bring it into conformity with the Gregorian text. Dr. Botte urged: 1) that within the Canon, the response "Amen" should be eliminated; 2) the fact that the Preface belongs to the Canon should be emphasized; 3) the number of prefaces should be increased.

The problem of language in the Liturgy was brought up by Fr. Schmidt, S.J., of the Gregorian University. A general discussion of liturgical language was followed by a treatment of the relation of liturgical language to the vernacular. It is a problem that must be examined in its every aspect. Though a common liturgical language is convenient, it is not *a priori* necessary. Arguments can be adduced both for and against a common language, arguments that vary according to circumstances of time and place. It cannot be denied that not only by reason of the Liturgy, but also in the interest of souls, a partial use of the vernacular would be advantageous—as *Mediator Dei* points out. The question of the use of the vernacular in the Mass has not been sufficiently clarified, nor is a complete solution possible. It is a matter for serious examination throughout the Church.

Dr. Stommel of the University of Bonn presented a study of the scripture readings in the Mass, including their history. He said that many have wished that these should be newly arranged and increased. As the faithful, thanks to Blessed Pius X, receive Holy Communion with greater frequency, so they should also be nourished by wisely chosen biblical teaching. He presented several ways in which these passages could be arranged with the help of competent scriptural and pastoral scholars. Dr. Chavasse of Lyons added some timely information on the history of these pericopes, especially in regard to "continuous" and "selected" readings.

Dr. Gy, O.P., of Le Saulchoir spoke of the history in France of the Prayer of the Faithful (prière du prone) from apostolic times to the present. The prayer formerly followed the instructional portion of the Mass, but at present it could not be restored as it existed in the past since it had sunk to a rather distorted form during the nineteenth century. But its reformulation, adapted to modern needs, seems clearly urgent for pastoral reasons.

The Reverend Odile Heiming, O.S.B., of Maria-Laach concerned himself with the reform of the Church calendar. He advocated that Easter be fixed on a definite Sunday, in order that the predominant influence of this feast have a stabilized date in the year. The feasts of Saints could then be removed from Lent with greater facility and to a greater extent than provided for in the newly revised Benedictine calendar, which had been projected as a model for future general reformation. Feasts during the Paschal season should likewise be reduced, and the remaining ones brought into greater conformity with the Paschal season. Even a requiem for Paschaltide should be composed. As no penitential functions should be performed during the Easter season, the Greater Litanies should be transferred to the Pentecostal Ember days.

Each talk was followed by general discussion to determine whether the representatives considered the proposed matter to have been satisfactorily solved, or on the contrary to be in need of more profound study. The Missa Cantata, the High Mass with Deacon and Subdeacon, was the central point of the discussion,

since it forms, ordinarily, the principal parochial Mass on Sunday. The delegates were in agreement on most of the points and left the following recommendations for the future reform of the Missal:

1. The celebrant should not be required to repeat readings and chants which are performed by other ministers. This follows the norm given by Rubric 15 of the new Easter Vigil.

2. The Confiteor at the foot of the altar should be recited silently on the way to the altar, as in ancient times, or omitted altogether as in the Easter Vigil.

3. Up to the Offertory the action should take place in the choir or at the sedilia as in the Pontifical Mass, and this according to Rubric 12 of the Easter rite.

4. The number of collects should be limited to one, or at the most two.

5. The lessons should be revised so as to distinguish: (a) a series of readings for Sundays, (b) a series to be used for the greater solemnities and feasts of saints, (c) and finally, a series set aside for ferial days. For the Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost, however, three or four series of readings should be outlined to be spread over three or four years and to be repeated in cycle. The present selections might be retained for the first year. The result would be that during the course of several years the faithful would become acquainted with more of Holy Scripture. Further, since the reading of Scripture is designed to aid in the instruction of the laity, all the members urged that the vernacular be allowed.

6. The Credo should be recited more rarely, and not at all during Octaves.

7. The Prayer of the Faithful should be restored after the exhortation "Oremus" at the beginning of the Offertory. This prayer seems to have had the form of a litany in which the particular needs of the faithful were mentioned while the people repeated the same prescribed response. Here, too, permission to use the vernacular is much to be desired.

8. As in Solemn Mass, so also in every public Mass, the sacred vessels and offerings should not be brought to the altar until just before the Offertory.

9. The number of prefaces should be increased, and in those that are used, the Passion should be stressed more than at present.

10. Ordinarily the celebrant should not begin the *Te Igitur* until after the choir has chanted both the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus*. Within the Canon, the response *Amen* should be suppressed.

11. The *Confiteor* and accompanying prayers usually said when communion is distributed during Mass should be omitted, since they have been borrowed from the rubrics for the distribution of communion outside of Mass.

12. Mass should end with the celebrant's blessing, omitting the Last Gospel, as the new Easter Rite already ordains.

There were several other problems brought forth which the assembly thought to be in need of further study. They concerned the Secret Prayer, the major doxology at the end of the Canon, the rearrangement of prayers and actions after the *Pater Noster*, the protraction of the Mass following Holy Communion, and finally the dismissal formula. These and other topics were to be studied and prepared for subsequent discussion in future congresses.

Mont-Sainte-Odile, 1952.

The work begun at the Maria-Laach Liturgical Conference was continued at another meeting held

at Mont-Sainte-Odile near Strasbourg in October, 1952. This was held by the Centre de Pastorale Liturgique of Paris in co-operation with the Trier Liturgical Conference. Forty liturgists from nine countries met to continue the work which was begun at Maria-Laach, namely the reform of the Roman Missal. They also considered some of the problems which have to be settled concerning the pastoral aspects of the Liturgy, and especially of the Mass. Under the title "Modern Men and the Mass" the needs of the laity and their reactions towards the Liturgy were studied.

One of the problems which the Maria-Laach conference left to be discussed was the order of events from the Pater Noster until the end of Mass. In our present Mass there is a lack of unity in the rites of breaking the Bread, the Agnus Dei, the Kiss of Peace, and the pre-Communion Prayers. Fr. Jungmann, S.J., showed that this is due to the suppression of the old Roman Rite for this part of the Mass. The present Mass retains only a few traces of the old Rite. He also points out the anomaly of having a *Communio* antiphon without an accompanying psalm. Formerly this antiphon was sung along with a psalm by all the people as they approached the altar for Communion. Fr. Jungmann suggested several ways in which this liturgical form of thanksgiving hymn could be made more meaningful and pertinent to present usage. He would also terminate the Mass with the priest's blessing, omitting the additions of later times.

By far the greater portion of the conference was devoted to a discussion of pastoral problems and their relation to the Liturgy. The members of the conference planned and discussed ways and means of integrating the laity with the Liturgy, and sought to guide efforts for future reforms according to the real needs of the faithful.

Father Daniel of the *Mission de Paris* expressed his opinion that the greatest pastoral difficulty comes from the world in which the Christian lives. He admitted that there are serious difficulties to be found in the Liturgy, problems of language, problems of understanding, problems of appreciation. But compared with the atheistic society in which man lives, these problems are not essential ones, but only accessory. Modern man lives in a society that is not even a good natural society, a society that seeks to create a materialistic civilization divorced from God. Such is the obstacle between man and the Church.

This talk suggested reflections from others in the group. Certainly the problem of understanding the symbols that the Church uses to explain her Mysteries is not a great one, though without doubt greater clarity and understanding would be of great help in appreciating the Mass. The ordinary Christian in the spirit of faith looks to the inner significance of his religion and ignores the lack of a more expressive symbol. A greater need is the creation of a living Christian community in which man can develop and practice his faith. Such a community must be a spiritual one, but it will have its roots in a temporal order built on charity and justice among men. There must be a Christian atmosphere in which man can develop and grow in the everyday life of a Christian.

Despite the more important problem of creating a Christian society for man, the question of symbolism in the Liturgy cannot be ignored. In discussing the laws that govern the use of symbolism in the Liturgy, Father Doncoeur, S.J., made a distinction between artificial and real symbols. Real symbols, such as the

symbol of bread and wine, the symbol of the table, and others, should be strengthened and clarified, while the artificial and so-called "mystical" symbols that have little or no intrinsic connection with the Mass should be eliminated.

Fr. Feret, O.P., spoke on "The Voice of God in the Mass." For him that voice is to be found not so much in the words, as in the meanings of the words, and still more in the actions of the Mass, through which God speaks to us. The Mass is an event, an eloquent active deed of God. Everything in it ought to be true, authentic. The Mass liturgy will not be faithful to its own broad viewpoint nor express its great variety of sentiments, especially its importance in the eternal salvation of mankind, unless it is at one moment exultant and pleading, at another, universal, at another, inspiring and saving. Since the voice of God as experienced in the Mass relies constantly and at every turn on the written word, it is certainly necessary that this written word be thoroughly understood. Hence the value and importance of the present renewed interest in Scripture.

There were several valuable papers on other problems of pastoral liturgy. Father Gunkel of Leipzig Oratory showed how, by means of vigorous and prudent efforts in adaptation, he and his associates had succeeded in building up a community spirit of profound and splendid vitality among the laity. One of the most important means used by the Germans to achieve some measure of success was the so-called "German High Mass" (Deutches Hochamt). While the celebrant sings and reads his part in Latin, the people sing their parts, both proper and ordinary, in German, either a direct translation or a paraphrase. This "German High Mass" was recognized by Rome as a legitimate German custom in 1943.

Canon Martimort pointed out the difficulty which is found in the use of the vernacular. Many parts of the Liturgy can not be translated and still retain the significance they have in the original, for example, the *Vexilla Regis,* or the *Exultet.* Should such classics be replaced, and can they be replaced? Now is the time to go beyond the vague perspectives hitherto considered in the question of use of the vernacular; now is the time to answer essential and definite questions.

All the delegates were in agreement that in spite of the modern difficulties, the effort to adapt the Liturgy to modern man must continue. In fact this was the very purpose of the whole meeting. The chief differences of opinion concerned the manner of accomplishing this adaptation. Pastors are seeking solutions to the problems of the faithful whom they serve. They desire reforms that are immediate and rather extensive. Because of this point of view, they are bound to differ with the point of view of the liturgist. The liturgist is conscious of his obligation to preserve the treasure of the Sacred Liturgy, the fruit of centuries of experience. Nothing in it can be changed without grave and sufficient reason. And so the liturgist is slow to advocate reforms except after long and serious reflection. Moreover, the liturgists wish to proceed slowly with adaptation lest one poor situation be replaced by one that is just as poor. Adaptation must leave room for simplicity and mobility, yet it must also meet the real needs of the faithful.

Future meetings such as the conference of Mont-Sainte-Odile are indispensable to providing a solution of the problem of adapting the Liturgy to modern man.

The ACT of Faith

Msgr. H. Francis Davis

Protestants know little of the continuous and live interest of Catholic theology in the dogmatic and psychological aspects of the act and virtue of faith. Catholics likewise know little or nothing of the completely different and independent tradition of distinctive Protestant theology on the subject. Protestants have made the question and meaning of faith a serious stumbling-block to their sympathetic understanding of the Catholic position. In this article from The Irish Theological Quarterly, *19(1952), pp. 102-115, Monsignor Davis gives a short comparative study of Catholic and Protestant positions on the act of faith.*

I propose to consider possible Catholic and Protestant answers to two questions which might arise out of Our Lord's words: "My sheep hear My voice." How do the sheep recognize the voice of the Shepherd? And, when the Shepherd speaks, does He merely call His sheep to Him, or does He teach them? The answers to these questions will be seen both to reflect and to perpetuate the breakaway of Protestant Christendom from its parent Catholicism.

The Protestant Answers

The Protestant view was originally the Reformation *fiducia,* the private assurance of one's personal justification of salvation. This view has been modified among some Protestants during the ensuing years. The doctrine which has survived to become typically Protestant answers the first question by asserting that our hearing of Our Lord's voice is due to the direct Call, Command, or Self-opening of the Divine Word to the predestined soul. It answers the second question: "Does He merely call His sheep, or also teach them," by making the Shepherd's voice primarily a call to repentance, together with an assurance of grace.

Karl Barth's View

Doctor Karl Barth holds that the image of God has been totally destroyed in man by sin, so that man has lost all capacity to hear God's voice. God's word, Dr. Barth says, in speaking to us, arouses a response, which is more justly called an actual hearing than a power to hear, for the response vanishes utterly when God is not actually speaking. The Christian who believes is more acted upon than acting. God, he insists, is always Subject, never Object; always agent, never passive. When God calls us, when His word addresses us, we cannot but hear and answer Him, and our answer is our faith. In spite of the words *subject* and *object,* Dr. Barth does admit that through faith we can know God, at any rate, as long as God graciously addresses us.

The General Protestant View

Protestants generally insist emphatically that faith involves a relation between two persons, between God and ourselves; it is belief in someone rather than belief in some truth. They do not, however, altogether exclude acceptance of a body of doctrine. But they all tend to make faith a pure adhesion of the will and to exclude it from the order of intelligence. Commonly they like to dismiss the Catholic idea of faith as cold intellectualism, having little relation to the heart of religion.

Some Exaggerations

There are non-Catholic exaggerations and caricatures that are alien not only to Catholic ideas, but also

to the genuinely Protestant idea of faith. Such caricatures make faith a sort of sixth sense, or a sort of feeling or experience. Another is the Quaker view of the inner supernatural light. In all these reason has no part in the recognition of the Shepherd's voice. For all typical non-rationalistic Protestantism, reason is the enemy, and Catholics are somewhat rationalist and pelagian.

Protestant Answer to Second Question

In their answer to the second question, these typical Protestant views of faith imply that the Shepherd's voice is more a call to repentance than the voice of a teacher. But few, if any, dare completely to exclude the intellectual element. Dr. Barth is well known for his life-long opposition to German Protestant rationalism and empiricism, and his defense of the supernatural and the creeds. Yet even he relates faith first to sin and redemption, and only secondarily to truth.

The trouble with so much of Protestant writing on the subject is that it is neither properly thought-out Protestantism nor wholehearted Catholicism. Usually it takes something from each system and gives an impression of colorlessness.

Critique of Protestant Answers

It is clear how unsound and ill-considered, even on Reformation principles, is the popular Protestant view that faith is nothing more than a vague trust and reliance, or even a mystical sense of abandonment. Such views merely confuse faith with hope, on the flimsy argument that the Greek word for faith often includes the notion of confidence or love. No Scripture scholar can attempt to assert that the traditional Christian notion of faith is unscriptural, merely on the ground that the scripture word for faith often has a far wider meaning. We must search in Scripture for the meaning, not for the word.

Nevertheless, among all Protestants there persists something of the Catholic notion of faith as an intellectual virtue—a virtue whereby we are able to recognize God's voice and accept the truths about Himself which He reveals.

So much confused with traditional *hope* has faith become that some writers, even among those who confess to the need of belief, have come to distinguish faith from the belief. Perhaps in the place of faith, hope, and charity, we shall soon be hearing of belief, faith, and fellowship.

The Catholic Answer

Let us now turn to Catholic Theology to see its answers to our questions. If we take the second question first, it is clear that Catholic faith, however much it may be ordered by free will, is deeply concerned with God under the aspect of truth, and so is intellectual. Faith for the Catholic cannot be divorced from *the* Faith. True Christian faith involves a deep and earnest love of the truth, because God is the truth, and because all holiness must be built, not on emotion, but on truth. It is the relationship of faith to truth and the intellect that above all separates Catholicism from Protestantism.

The reasoning process which forms the foundation of most people's faith, the process which makes it a reasonable faith, is of a nature to escape formulation. This is how it can easily happen that it is partly unperceived, and rarely adequately expressed. No one has written more about this spontaneous reasoning, which is true reasoning though definitely informal and non-syllogistic, than Cardinal Newman. According to him, "persons may have good reasons which they cannot bring into words." It seems that we

must admit with Newman that we each have our own personal, though not purely subjective way of discovering truth—a type of reasoning which can be influenced by the reasoning of others, but is neither purely impersonal nor capable of being put down on paper. This is the reasoning which leads us to all our important decisions, including the Faith.

Necessary Dispositions

It would seem that some grace is required to enable one to perform this process of reasoning successfully. One must have a certain humility, by which one looks towards God; by which one regards God as the objective truth with one's whole being. There must be a readiness to accept propositions too deep or intricate for our understanding, and to bow down before them as real and independent of human judgment, as concrete facts.

Surely, all our experience of the phenomena of conversion tells us that faith does not normally come as a bolt from the blue, divorced from struggles, thoughts, and prayers. And surely experience also teaches us the error of the popular view which would have us always approach the Faith by rigid and conscious formal reasoning, flawlessly proving God's existence, Christ's miracles and so forth.

Catholics reject the view that the Shepherd's voice comes to each by a kind of immediate auditory or intellectual experience, so that we both distinctly hear and know that *God* is speaking. Such an experience is possible, but the normal person first recognizes that it is God who is speaking by considering the evidence in the light of reasoning. Surely this reasoning is normally informal; but it *is* reasoning, and known to the individual as sound. Even defeat in formal argument fails to shake the confidence of the man who is convinced he is acting reasonably, once his personal *phronesis* approves his course of action.

Two Schools of Thought

At this point we pass beyond the field where Catholic theologians are in complete agreement. During the last fifty years, there have been two schools of thought to explain exactly how our reasoning convinces us, and carries us right through to the act of faith exclusively.

One school, though with all Catholics it insists on a reasoning approach, teaches that faith must be there to enable us to see the force of the reasoning. Reasoning alone will never teach us that a doctrine is credible. Faith must come in right at the beginning. Faith will give us the moral attitude, the supernatural inclination of mind, which will enable us to see the force of the arguments. According to this view, faith gives one the disposition of mind, whereby one can see the reasons; and so makes one know that it is God who is speaking. Involved in this action, and solely from grace, will be the implicit acceptance of all God says. This school of thought has the advantage of insisting on the loving, trustful contact between divine Person and human throughout the process.

The Second School

The "classical" Catholic theology insists that the first stages, perhaps right up to the judgment of credibility, should normally be under the direction of reason without faith. Reason prepares the way, but, from the moment of justification, faith takes over. The act of faith proceeds from the grace of faith, but in no way influences any process of reasoning, especially not the process by which one arrives at its threshold. The defenders of this view find it hard to explain the transition between the reasoning process and the act of faith.

If this view means, as Father Gardeil contended, that God miraculously enables the uneducated faithful to accept the faith without a fully reasonable foundation, then it seems less in harmony with the universal Catholic tradition that reason for all men is a God-given guide, and that God does not ask even the uneducated to act irrationally. It is certainly out of harmony with Newman's conviction that all men reason, though not all men can give a reason.

Conclusion

The purpose of this article has been to gain a better understanding of our position and that of Protestantism regarding the act of faith. When the Protestant today says that we are saved by faith alone, he does not mean that we are saved by holding to certain doctrines, regardless of our other sentiments or actions. Nor does he commonly mean, in its exact original sense, that we are saved by Lutheran or Calvinistic *fiducia*. He means rather that we are saved by a God-given sense of our own sinfulness together with a God-given assurance that God is reconciling us through Christ. Protestantism remains, as Newman stated was its characteristic, right in what it asserts, wrong in what it denies. In stressing the element of grace and trust, and underlining the personal relationship involved in faith, it agrees with the best Catholic tradition; in diminishing or neglecting the relation between faith and truth, and in tearing faith from its rational basis, it is negative and follows the characteristic Reformation tradition.

THE PUBLIC CHARACTER OF PROTESTANTISM

Erik Peterson, "A Correspondence with Adolph Harnack and an Epilogue," *The Dublin Review*, 116(1952), pp. 41-57.

(The following is a summary of the epilogue.)

A. At the time of the Reformation, Protestantism had many of the marks of a dogmatic church because of:

1. *Its close connection with the Catholic Church.*

a. Legal assignment established historical continuity between Protestant bishops and their Catholic predecessors.

b. Protestants and Catholics had a common dogmatic basis in the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian creeds.

2. *Its establishment as the state religion.*

a. Traditional Protestantism recognized no "canon law" in the real sense. However, it presupposed the validity of the territorial sovereign's laws *within* the church.

b. Traditional Protestantism had no dogma, for it lacked the doctrinal authority required to pass judgment in such matters. However, while the State supervised maintenance of doctrine, it did have a quasi-dogma in the form of doctrinal treatises.

B. With its widening split from Catholicism and with disestablishment, what was latent became actual. Without public authority there is:

1. *No "church,"* for a "church" is quite different from a "sect";

2. *No theology,* for this rests on dogma, which in turn rests on public authority.

C. This elimination of the "old Catholic element" leads to a dilemma:

1. With the breakup of the Christian State an historical return to traditional Protestantism is impossible.

2. The other attempts to compensate for this loss contradict the original spirit of Evangelical Protestantism.

a. *Rationalism* seeks to replace the loss of "pure doctrine" by the universal truths of reason. *However,* Luther never thought of replacing dogma by reason.

b. *Pietism* seeks to replace mystical experience (threatened by the loss of dogma) with an absorption in religious emotion. *However,* this way of secularized mysticism is blocked by Luther's struggles against "fanatics."

c. *Works of charity and foreign missions* are made into an "active proof" that Protestantism *is* public in character. However, faith and works are basically separate in traditional Protestantism.

TELEOGENESIS:

A New *Finalistic* Theory of Evolution

Bermudo Meléndez

In his encyclical letter, Humani Generis, *of August 12, 1950, Pope Pius XII deplored the attitude of those who treat the theory of evolution "as if there were nothing in the sources of divine revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this question." This article, "Teleogenesis,"* Razón y Fe, *145(1952), pp. 36-46, presents a stimulating approach to the problem and one in full accord with papal directives. Herein Fr. Meléndez highlights a fact often overlooked by secularistic scientists, viz., the finalistic character necessary to any theory which would attempt to explain the facts thus far ascertained by paleontology.*

Professor Leonardi of the University of Ferrara has published a book entitled *L'evoluzione dei viventi (The Evolution of Living Things)* which contains a new theory called "Teleogenesis." It gives a new turn to old theories of final causality and deserves to be widely publicized.

According to the author, evolution appears demonstrated within certain reasonable limits. He treats comprehensively the problem of organic evolution, analyzing the arguments in favor of the evolutionary process, especially those proper to paleontology. His conclusion is that at the present time the principle of the immutability of species cannot reasonably be maintained. When the author says evolution appears to be a fact, he does not mean *transformism,* which is only a hypothesis. Still less does he mean monophyletism (the evolution of all living beings from one simple form of life), which finds no demonstration in the arguments of paleontology.

Facts seem to warrant this description of evolution.

1. Evolution has been neither uniform in time, nor continuous, nor simultaneous, nor general.

2. Evolution has been limited, but it is difficult to establish within what bounds it has existed.

3. In general, evolution is progressive, but there are cases where it is regressive and even degenerative.

4. Each organism has an evolutionary cycle independent of the rest.

5. Within the process internal agents are acting, independent of surrounding circumstances.

6. Evolution is fundamentally finalistic.

The theories existing today do not adequately account for the facts. Professor Leonardi briefly reviews the theories of Darwin, Lamarck, Naegeli, Lotsy, Ross, Osborn, and Blanc; his conclusion is that none of these explains the totality of the facts because none considers the essential character of evolution, its finality. All appeal to factors which undoubtedly influence the process by conditioning it but are not the ultimate cause. Accordingly, Professor Leonardi proposes his new theory of "teleogenesis," which emphasizes both individual finality in the animal and vegetal world and the over-all harmony which has

always existed throughout the whole domain of living organisms.

To clear the air of possible misconceptions in this matter, he says a word about evolution's finality in relation to chance phenomena and static organisms. First, it is to be noted that finality is not quite the same as perfection; for what is destructive of an individual or a species can be of great utility to a more extended group of organisms. Secondly, finality does not exclude chance phenomena according to the laws of probability. A factory, for example, along with its perfectly finished products, turns out a number of useless and imperfect ones "by chance"; but finality is still quite evident in the construction. Thirdly, if there is evolution, why do some organisms remain static while others actively evolve into an organism of superior organization? The author explains this by the necessity of maintaining an order of equilibrium in nature, which is indispensable if life is to be possible upon earth. Each group of organisms has a function in nature which is permanently determined. Superior types cannot subsist without inferior ones, and inferior types demand the simultaneous existence of the microorganisms. Collectively in this equilibrium they accomplish functions of which they are not capable individually.

Teleogenesis

Evolution portrays the origin of life as follows. It is probable that life appeared first of all in the sea, the first organisms being simple and perhaps microscopic. It is equally possible that life may have originated simultaneously in various places where the physico-chemical conditions were such as to permit life to appear and develop. But we know nothing about what type these organisms were, nor whether they were all equal or differentiated.

Evolution arises out of the very constitution of the organisms. Such proto-organisms, from the moment of their appearance, would have a constitution and some well-determined evolutionary tendencies toward a complete and polymorphous development, independent of chance circumstances. From the very outset, with an interdependence on all other living beings, they were coordinated toward their organic development. From the very act of creation, each particle of inorganic matter probably received well-defined properties and functions which only in the future would be able to originate a determined development.

The gradual rise of new organisms follows a plan of God. He confided the gradual realization of His plan to a conjunction of natural forces, which develop and progressively transform organisms in a determined direction, according to the function in nature assigned to each organic group and each one of its elements.

Evolution is not one force but a system of forces. It is an extremely complex process, whose manifestations are the result of a system of variable and even contrary agents, all producing the equilibrium of the life-world throughout time.

Facts today say that evolution is eminently finalistic. An extraordinary union of facts demonstrates the finality of natural phenomena. When evolution reveals itself, the transformations in the main are orientated toward a goal. We must consider them the result of a definite, preordained plan following natural laws.

An Internal, Essential Property

Accordingly, in the author's view, evolution, or the tendency to evolve, should be reckoned an essential property of living matter. It reveals itself in organisms by an internal

tendency to variation, to originate individuals within each species more or less different from their progenitors, and to transmit new characteristics as hereditary. This variation may be a sudden, important mutuation, or a slow, gradual one.

Evidence for an internal factor in the origin of new variations is as follows: 1) Experiment has proved that the mutuations caused by spontaneous changes of the genetic patrimony can originate new forms. 2) These alterations can be produced under the influence of external factors, such as certain radiations. The fact that the natural radiations to which individuals are normally subject are insufficient to originate them, leads us to think that such alterations can also be due to internal factors. 3) Besides, the fact that distinct phyla evolve along parallel lines shows that evolution is due to an internal impulse, common to the phyletic trunk, and not solely due to fortuitous causes in environment.

Evolution is not governed by chance or external environment, but by an internal plan. The orthogenetic or self-directed variations, so frequent in paleontology, evidently correspond to an orientated evolution. Though they seemingly correspond to mutational processes, they also show that the phenomenon of mutation is not due solely to external factors. The simple conjunction of mutations, at least such as appear in laboratory experience, even if they are postulated as the effects of natural selection, cannot explain orthogenetic evolution and adaptation.

The Internal Factor at Work

An internal mechanism of auto-regulation would solve the problem. The mutational process follows a mechanism of auto-regulation in the organisms, analogous to that which is found in the various organs. Only thus can Lamarck's adaptation be placed in accord with the concept of preadaptation. Preadaptation can only be explained by a predisposition of the organism, prior to environmental changes, to react in a determined way with a view to the survival of the species.

The auto-regulator proper to organisms works this way. It provokes the appearance of varied mutations, and by virtue of natural selection only those survive that are advantageous for the organism. This assures the survival of the phylum, with forms distinct from the preceding ones and progressively better adapted to their new surroundings. When variation or a disequilibrium of the surrounding medium puts the very existence of a species in danger, mutations appear suddenly *(saltus)*. Generally, such mutations appear in order to anticipate such a danger or to facilitate the expansion of organisms in diverse surrounding media.

It seems more probable that external factors work like catalysts, not like causes. They determine and provoke the manifestation of evolutionary energy which lies latent in the genetic patrimony of a determined organism. The external world confronts the organism with circumstances which force it to a new adjustment either to survive or to reestablish the altered biological equilibrium. Evolution can be progressive or regressive, but these concepts are relative. At times they are inverted, when a large biological group is considered instead of the individual. Degeneration can be considered an absolute regressive evolution, and often marks the proximate extinction of a biological group.

The Destiny of Organisms

At first organisms are plastic; gradually, however, they become more stable and specialized. Each

group of organisms normally presents in its initial phase of development a plasticity and a polymorphism much more marked than in its successive forms. Specialization and adaptation seem to be in inverse proportion to evolutionary capacity. The more specialized an organism becomes, the smaller the further transformations it can undergo. As a result, only organisms that preserve generalized characteristics progress toward higher grades of organization. The rest, when separated from the phyletic trunk by originating specialized collateral branches, retain only the small evolutionary capacity necessary for their own progressive adaptation to a determined environment or for a predetermined function toward equilibrium in the life-world.

Some elements become stabilized and indelibly inscribed. Non-specialized elements susceptible of further evolution arrive at a certain specific stability. The new characteristics which differentiate them from their ancestral species remain indelibly and irreversibly inscribed in the genetic patrimony. The rest virtually preserve their capacity to evolve. At the first opportunity evolution reappears because of the interplay of internal and external stimuli. At times after a period of inactivity this produces a sudden new form well within the ambit of the same species. At other times new mutuations cause polymorphic populations, in which the selective process already described repeats itself, thus leading to the formation of a new species.

Organisms have a two-fold destiny. On the one hand, according to the author, by an innate impulse they are destined to progress toward a level of organization, each time more elevated, up to man; on the other, they help perpetuate life and maintain the equilibrium of the life-world.

The Dynamic Equilibrium

Environment, the catalyst, can aid or impede evolution. In each organism, the innate tendency toward a superior level of organization can be facilitated or resisted by environmental circumstances. As a result, the evolutionary process is not continuous, but presents instead periods of intense activity, alternating wtih others of relative calm or total stability. A new environment resulting from a migration can produce a sudden rebirth of the evolutionary impulse in a phylum not overly specialized, and actual *explosions* of forms occur. Something analogous happens when the biological equilibrium is broken. The reborn evolutionary impulse originates processes more or less rapid and extensive in order to attain a new equilibrium in a brief space of time between the transformed organisms and the new environment.

The auto-regulator is a power that brings each organism and each organ back to normal when equilibrium is disturbed. It seems logical that a similar power should exist on a grand scale in the totality of the life-world, maintaining in the course of time an over-all equilibrium between countless interdependent organisms and the environment.

The normal evolutionary cycle of any biological group is like a parabolic curve: a progressive ascent to a peak, a longer or shorter period of flowering (which, if perfect equilibrium with environment has been achieved, has lasted from the earliest times to the present), and a gradual descent toward extinction. Surrounding media may determine the moment of flowering, and also contribute to the disappearance of species. But we cannot explain the

disappearance of a species preceded by evident symptoms of degeneration unless we postulate an internal factor as the primary cause of this rise and fall. The interdependence of superior and inferior organisms is also a factor. The disappearance of one biological group can determine the death of another, thus causing important changes in the equilibrium of the life-world. In this way we can explain why certain organisms reach a very high level of organization, while others rapidly reach a state of stability with very limited transformations. These lower states of organization are necessary for the development of superior organisms.

The Origin of the Human Body

In conclusion, Professor Leonardi explains the possible origin of the human body from a division of the phyletic trunk of Anthropoid forms. He is very careful to point out, however, that this is no more than a simple working hypothesis.

He is a partisan of Bolk's hypothesis of foetation *(fetalización)*. In this process the first human neotenic form would originate by means of a sudden mutation, and would have generalized and synthetic characteristics. From this first primitive human form, in the opinion of the author, a polymorphous population could originate. Thus there would coexist the original form and other new forms originated by mutations. Among these new forms some would be more marked by pithecoid characteristics (regressive), while others (progressive and neotenic) would have characteristics ever closer to *Homo Sapiens*.

In such a polymorphous population, by a process of segregation in the manner outlined by the cosmolisis of Rosa, a certain number of phyla would have developed and evolved in parallel. They can be distributed into three groups:

1. *Phyla with synthetic characteristics,* analogous to the original form, which probably became extinct in the middle Pleistocene, with forms analogous to those of Steinheim and Palestine.

2. *Phyla with pithecoid characteristics,* more or less pronounced, which at first undergo a progressive evolution in a humanoid direction, followed by a rapid stability maintained up to a recent period of time, or followed by a degenerative regression into forms which, as a group, are called Neanderthal.

3. *Phyla with distinctly humanoid characteristics,* ever closer to the present characteristics of man, which begin in the lower Pleistocene with forms analogous to those of Swanscombe, and include all the ancient and modern races of *Homo Sapiens*.

Only the third of these phyletic branches has come down to present times. The author concludes by noting that this form can be reconciled both the monogenetic origin of mankind and the coexistence, which seems demonstrated, of human types distinctly differentiated even from the lower Pleistocene.

Critical Appreciation

This theory is eminently finalistic and vitalistic, totally orthodox from the Catholic viewpoint. In our opinion, although a hypothesis in good part, it explains sufficiently well the evolutionary process such as paleontology presents it to us. Professor Leonardi's work of synthesis is one of the more serious and better orientated studies which exist today upon the subject of organic evolution in all its aspects. Of greatest interest, perhaps, is his theory of Teleogenesis which harmonizes the finality of evolution with the play of cosmological and environmental agents.

Barth, Brunner: The Analogy of Being

Anyone familiar with the Thomistic synthesis knows the important role played in it by the analogy of being. Its importance is further shown by the dispute between the eminent Protestant theologians, Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. This abstract is taken from Father P. C. Hubatka's article, "Momentum analogiae entis in theologia dialectica Caroli Barth et Aemilii Brunner et in Thomismo," which appeared in Doctor Communis, *May-Dec., 1950, pp. 187-192.*

Karl Barth explicitly states: "There is no analogy of being." By the analogy of being, Barth understands some sort of trinitarian tendency inherent in creatures. Thus the analogy of being enables Catholics to supply for divine revelation, and without revelation, to speak about God and divine things. Being a substitute for revelation, the analogy of being is a wicked invention of Antichrist. It is the sole reason for not accepting Catholicism.

However, Barth does admit an *analogy of faith.* He expressly teaches: "There is no analogy of being, but only an analogy of faith."

Barth's principal argument against the analogy of being is found in his doctrine of man's nature and its corruption by original sin. After original sin, man lives only in darkness. Every word is an untruth. This holds even with regard to divine revelation. God uses human words in speaking to man. Hence, between the words of God and the things revealed, there exists a contradiction. Human words, therefore, are inept as a means of manifesting God. We really do not know what we mean when we call God the "Father," or the "Son," or the "Holy Ghost."

Emil Brunner says rightly that such an analogy of being (as understood by Barth) is pure nominalism. The reason for calling God the "Father," would not consist in the fact that God is compared to a father, but only in the fact that Scripture calls Him "Father." Thus God would not have been the Father before creation, but became the Father only through the word of revelation.

In opposition to Karl Barth, Emil Brunner defends his thesis: *The analogy of being* is not a specifically Catholic doctrine, but is the foundation of all theology, whether Christian or pagan. Brunner says Barth is the first theologian to view the analogy of being as the point of opposition and difference between Protestants and Catholics.

The difference between Catholic and Protestant theology, according to Brunner, is not in the use of analogy, but in the quality and the manner of applying the analogy. There is a true analogy in creatures by which man can come to a true knowledge of God. But this aptitude of coming to a true knowledge of God becomes known to sinful man only through revelation.

Brunner does not admit a natural nature, but only a supernatural one. Through original sin the supernatural life of man did not utterly perish, but its nature was partially corrupted. In man one must distinguish between the formal and material image of God. The formal image—human nature itself—was by no means corrupted; the material image was completely destroyed by original sin. As a result, the knowledge of God can in no wise be salvific for the sinner, but is necessarily false and polytheistic in tendency. Brunner, since he denies that there are two natures, one natural, the other supernatural, cannot admit in wayfaring man a natural and a supernatural image. The distinction, he says, between the natural and the supernatural is not good theology; neither is the distinction between a natural image and a supernatural image of God. The entire nature of the sinner and of the redeemed man is supernatural. It can be easily understood why Brunner denies the traditional doctrine of original sin, just as he denies the historical fact of the first sin of Adam.

Against Barth, Thomistic doctrine maintains that there is a true analogy of being which enables us to come to a knowledge not only of God's existence, but also of His nature—though not in the same way. When attributes—goodness, life, etc.—are predicated of God, one must distinguish the attribute predicated, and the mode of the predication. We have positive, though analogous, knowledge of the former; negative of the latter. Thus our knowledge of God is based on the analogy of being. But this knowledge is natural; has its limits; is in no way a compensation for revelation; is not sufficient for salvation. Besides this natural knowledge of God there is another, supernatural, which alone is able to save, based on the fact of revelation and therefore upon the *analogy of faith.*

Against Brunner, Thomists maintain that, because of their specifically diverse formal objects, these two types of knowledge, the natural and the supernatural, cannot be reduced to the analogy of being. Thus the analogy of faith presupposes the analogy of being.

A Partial List of Journals Consulted in Selecting Articles for THEOLOGY DIGEST

ANGELICUM
Quarterly review of theology, canon law, and philosophy published by the Faculty of the Angelicum; Salita del Grillo 1, Rome, Italy.

BLACKFRIARS
Monthly journal of theology edited by the Dominican Fathers of Oxford. Blackfriars Publications, 34 Bloomsbury Street, London W.C.1, England.

CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY
Quarterly journal of scriptural studies published by the Catholic Biblical Assn. of America; The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

CIENCIA TOMISTA
Quarterly review of theology published by the Spanish Dominican Fathers of the University of Salamanca. Apartado 17, Salamanca, Spain.

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA
Bi-weekly review of ecclesiastical questions published by the Jesuit Fathers. Via di Porta Pinciana 1, Rome (130), Italy.

CLERGY REVIEW
Monthly review of theology published in London. Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 28 Ashley Place, London S.W.1, England.

COLLATIONES BRUGENSES
Bi-monthly journal of theology published by the diocesan clergy of Bruges. Groot Seminarie, Bruges, Belgium.

DIEU VIVANT
Review of theology published three times a year. Éditions du Seuil, 27, rue Jacob, Paris VI, France.

DIVUS THOMAS
Quarterly journal of philosophy and theology edited by the Faculty of the Albertinum (Universitat Freiburg). Paulusverlag, Freiburg, Switzerland.

DOCTOR COMMUNIS
Review of the Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas (Rome) published three times a year. Casa Editrice Marietti, via Legnano, 23, Torino, Italy.

DUBLIN REVIEW
Quarterly journal of philosophical and religious thought. Burns Oates, 28 Ashley Place, London S.W.1, England.

ÉGLISE VIVANTE
Quarterly journal of missiology published under the direction of the Société des Auxiliaires des Missions, 81, rue Madame, Paris VI, France.

EPHEMERIDES LITURGICAE
Liturgical quarterly published by the Vincentian Fathers. Via Pompeo Magno 21, Rome, Italy.

EPHEMERIDES THEOLOGICAE LOVANIENSES
Quarterly journal of theology and canon law edited by the Faculty of Theology, University of Louvain. Firme Charles Beyaert, rue Notre-Dame 8, Bruges, Belgium.

ESTUDIOS ECLESIÁSTICOS
Quarterly review of theology edited by the Jesuit Fathers. Ediciones Fax, Zurbano 80, Madrid, Spain.

FRANCISCAN STUDIES
Quarterly review of theology edited by the Franciscan Institute. St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.

GEIST UND LEBEN
Bi-monthly journal of ascetical and mystical theology edited by the Jesuit Fathers of Munich. Echter-Verlag, Würzburg, Germany.

GREGORIANUM
Quarterly journal of philosophy and theology published by the Jesuit Fathers of the Pontifical Gregorian University; Piazza della Pilotta 4, Rome, Italy.

IRISH THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY
Quarterly journal of theology published by the Faculty of St. Patrick's College; Maynooth, Ireland.

***JOURNAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY**
Journal of ecclesiastical history published twice yearly. Faber & Faber Ltd., 24 Russell Square, London W.C.1, England.

***JOURNAL OF RELIGION**
Quarterly journal of theology published by the Divinity School, University of Chicago. U. of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Illinois.

LAVAL THÉOLOGIQUE ET PHILOSOPHIQUE
Journal of theology and philosophy appearing twice yearly, published by Université Laval; Québec, Canada.

LIFE OF THE SPIRIT
Monthly ascetical journal edited by the Dominican Fathers of Oxford. Blackfriars Publications, 34 Bloomsbury Street, London W.C.1, England.

LUMEN VITAE
Quarterly review (English Ed.) published by the International Center for Studies in Religious Education. 27, rue de Spa, Bruxelles, Belgium.

MELITA THEOLOGICA
Review of theology published by the Royal University Students' Theological Assn.; Royal University, Malta.

NEW SCHOLASTICISM
Quarterly journal of philosophy published by the American Catholic Philosophical Assn. The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.

NOUVELLE REVUE THÉOLOGIQUE
Monthly review of theology edited by the Jesuits of the Collége S. Albert, Louvain. Etabl. Casterman, 28, rue des Soeurs Noires, Tournai, Belgium.

QUESTIONS LITURGIQUES ET PAROISSIALES
Bi-monthly journal of liturgical thought published by the Benedictines of the Abbaye du Mont-César; Louvain, Belgium.

RAZÓN Y FE
Monthly review of Hispano-American culture containing articles on theology and philosophy. Ediciones Fax, Zurbano, 80, Madrid, Spain.

***RELIGION IN LIFE**
Quarterly of Christian opinion and discussion published by Abingdon-Cokesbury; Nashville 2, Tennessee.

REVUE BIBLIQUE
Quarterly published under the direction of the École Pratique d'Études Bibliques (Jerusalem). J. Gabalda et Cie., rue Bonaparte 90, Paris, France.

REVUE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
Quarterly review of theology published by the Oblate Fathers; Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada.

RIVISTA DI VITA SPIRITUALE
Quarterly review of ascetical and mystical theology published by the Discalced Carmelite Fathers in Rome; Corso d'Italia, 38, Rome, Italy.

SCRIPTURE
Quarterly journal of the Catholic Biblical Association (England); 141a Kensington High Street, London W.8, England.

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES
Quarterly journal of theology published by the Theological Faculties of the Society of Jesus in the United States; Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland.

THEOLOGISCH-PRAKTISCHE QUARTALSCHRIFT
Quarterly review of philosophy and theology edited by the Faculty of the Diocesan Seminary, Linz, Austria. Landstrasse 41, Linz a. d. Donau, Austria.

VIE SPIRITUELLE
Monthly journal of ascetical and mystical theology published by the Dominican Fathers. Édition du Cerf, 29 Boul. de Latour-Maubourg, Paris (7), France.

WORSHIP
Monthly review of liturgical thought published by the Benedictines of St. John's Abbey; Collegeville, Minnesota.

Journals marked with an asterisk are not Catholic publications.

Names and addresses of journals having digests or abstracts in this issue have been included above although they may have appeared in the first issue. This list will be continued in subsequent issues of THEOLOGY DIGEST.